OR,

A Moderate Enquiry

INTO THE

VVARRANTABLENESSE

OF THE

PREACHING

OF

GIFTED and UNORDAINED Persons.

Where also some other Questions are discussed:

VIZ.

Concerning { MINISTERIAL Relation, ELECTION, ORDINATION.

BEING A

VINDICATION

Of the Late

Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici,

So far as concerns those Points; From the Exceptions of M^r. *John Martin*, M^r. *Sam. Petto*, M^r. *Frederick Woodal*: Ministers in *Suffolk*, in their late Book, Intituled

THE PREACHER SENT.

By MATTHEW POOLE, At the desire and appointment of the Provinciall Assembly of *London*.

LONDON,

Printed by *J. H.* for *J. Rothwell*, at the Fountain in Goldsmiths-row in Cheapside, and *S. Thomson*, at the Bishops Head in Pauls Church-Yard. 16[illegible]

A Moderate Enquiry

INTO THE

WARRANTABLENESSE

OF THE

PREACHING

OF

GIFTED and UNORDAINED Persons,

Where also some other Questions are discussed:

viz.

Concerning { Ministerial Relation, Election, Ordination.

RELIGIO A

VINDICATION

Of the Late

Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici,

So far as concerns those Points, From the Exceptions of M. *John Martin*, M. *Sam. Petto*, M. *Frederick Woodal*: Ministers in *Suffolk*, in their late Book, Intituled

THE PREACHER SENT.

By Matthew Poole, At the desire and appointment of the Provincial Assembly of *London*.

LONDON.

Printed by *J. H. for J. Robinson*, at the Fountain in Goldsmith-Rowe in Chancery-Lane, at the Bishop-Head in Ivy-Lane, Church-Yard.

The Epistle to the Reader.

It is the great unhappineſſe of moſt men, that they judge of things by appearance, and not according to truth; That thoſe wayes and doctrines which are moſt ſpecious in ſhew, which ſeemingly look moſt to the promotion of Gods honour, the advancement of holineſſe, and the liberties of Gods people, are moſt taking with many of that ſort of perſons, who have a due ſence of thoſe excellent things upon their ſpirits; and ſuch an opinion, I take this to be, which is the principall ſubject of this following Treatiſe, which is aſſerted by our Brethren; Viz. That Gifted perſons may Preach publickly: *An opinion wherein there is a double compliance, with the apprehenſions and affections of men, whereby it gets entertainment among them: Either, becauſe it gives an opportunity for the declaration, and demonſtration of a mans abilities to others, (a diſeaſe incident to good men) or becauſe it puts a man into a capacity of honouring God in a more eminent way: (which a gracious ſoul is very apt to thirſt after) And, if, to theſe be added, and upon theſe do follow a third thing, to wit, an experience of ſome honour brought to God, and ſome good done upon others, this puts it out of doubt, with divers good men, and makes them ſit down with a confident perſwa-*

sion of the truth of it. And on the other side, when a Minister undertakes to refute and overthrow that opinion, he lies under this great prejudice, of minding his own interests, of envying the Lord's people this glorious priviledge, and desiring to monopolize it to himself; And so, whatever he saith upon that account, is rather taken as the issue of his own passions, then the sence of the Scripture: But, because I have learned to judge of things otherwise then by events and appearances, and the humours or censures of men. I dare not decline a necessary work upon the account of any reflections which may be cast upon me thereby, but shall leave the vindication of my credit, and the bringing forth of my righteousnesse to God, and (as in duty I ought) ingage for the assertion of the truth in this particular; Which I am the more willing to do, because (if the providence of God may be observed, and if the tree may be judged by the fruit) there is hardly any one principle, which hath been more scandalous to thousands of the most judicious of Gods people, (both Ministers and others) and more unhappily instrumentall to the introduction, and propagation of all those loose, false, vain, frivolous and pernicious doctrines (which abound in the Nation) then the profession and practise of this specious opinion of liberty of prophesying. Nor doth this onely flow from the abuse of that principle, (as our Brethren would insinuate) but from the very principle it self, as they state it: For so long as they hold, that, It is the duty of every gifted man, as such, to exercise his gifts, (*which they assert pag.* 32.) *and that,* if he have received gifts to teach publickly, he must use them also publickly; (*which they avow, pag.* 47.) *and that,* he himself may judge of his gifts, and may preach, though it be not so expedient, without any further Call: (*which they professe, pag.* 20.) *What can be expected, but that this Doctrine should be a* Trojan Horse, *whence the adversaries of the Truth may break out, and destroy the City of God, as* Pandora's Box, *from whence all*

sorts

sort of mischiefe and foul poysoning opinions may fly out, and that without remedy. It must be here seasonably remembred, that the point here discussed is no triviall point, but one that nearly concerns the very vitals of the Church, to whose welfare nothing under God and his Word, is more necessary and conducible, then the Ordinance of the Ministery; And therefore nothing requires greater care in the disposal of it, then that doth, and in nothing were the Apostles more solicitous then in committing this Office and worke to fit persons, and nothing would have been more incongruous to the wisdome and faithfulnesse of the head of the Church, then to prostitute them to the fancies and humours of every invader, nothing more unbecoming the carefulnesse of our great shepherd, then to suffer any wolfe (that saith or thinks he is fit for it) to take the office of the shepherd, or to do his work, both which come to one, and are utterly pernitious to the flock. The consideration of these and such like things, occasioned the Provincial Assembly to take it into their serious thoughts; not onely to assert the Office of the Ministry, but also to regulate the work of the Ministry, and to confine it within those just boundaries which God and man have set for it. This was done in that late peece called Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici, a peece which as it hath through Gods blessing been satisfactory to the consciences of many persons, so hath it had a contrary effect upon others, (as might in reason be expected) to draw forth and derive opposition upon it, from divers hands, and among others, those of our Brethren, with whom I have now to do. And although it is not fit, nor usuall for Assemblies to take notice of the contradictions of particular persons; yet, because our Brethren have with united force undertaken the refutation of part of that Treatise, and because they have indeavoured to manage it with Scripture Arguments and evidence, (which justly bear most sway in these times) and because divers well-meaning persons, (and that not onely such as being injudicious, are inconsiderable

siderable, but also such as seems to be pillars in their way) have declared their high approbation of it, and asserted the unanswerableneſse of it. It was therefore thought fit that something should be done by way of reply: And accordingly the Provinciall Assembly was pleased to lay it upon my shoulders, and I ingaged in the work, and as I love not unnecessary delayes, so I haped long since to have given the World an account of it: But it pleased that Supream Providence (which orders all affaires) unexpectedly to surprize me, with a sad and dangerous convulsion, which being seated in the head, did not onely disinable me for the present, but a pretty while after overawe me, so that I was diſswaded from meddling in any thing, whereby the brain might be exercised, and discomposed: and moreover, it is not unknown to many, that a work of far greater concernment, and paines, and trouble, and care, did lie in my hands all along, interfering with this, which indeed required the whole man; besides many other occasions not inconsiderable, which is needlesse and impertinent, for me here to speak of: Onely thus much I have here mentioned by way of Apologie, why this Reply comes forth no sooner, and it may further Apologize for the frequent defects which may be observed in it, because I was so continually incumbred with distracting cares, about other affaires, whereof I have many witnesses. This delay therefore the Reader is intreated to pardon, and to accept of the service, as it is now tendred, wherein, though I doubt not, it will be easie to the wise to observe many weaknesses, yet God and my conscience are my compurgators, that I have managed it with sincerity, and I hope my Reader will witnesse that I have handled it with the same candor and moderation which our Brethren have shewn, and which I think ought to be shewn in such differences as these. For the successe of this work, as I am not without hope, that there will be found some, ex meliore luto, who laying aside partiality, will own the evidence here brought, and yeeld to it, (for I may without vani-

ty

ty ſay, that there is ſome evidence and cogency, at leaſt in ſome things in difference) ſo I muſt confeſſe, when I conſider, how weak and injudicious moſt are, and unable to diſcern between things that differ, how ſupine and careleſſe the generality even of good men are, in the weighing of things of this nature, (and yet uſually ſuch as are leaſt knowing, are moſt confident and heady) how apt the moſt are to be led by the reputation of ſome particular men of their party for ability and piety, how deeply mens intereſts are concerned herein; and in particular their honour in not ſeeming to be baſted, and deſerting that way they are once ingaged in: I ſay, when I conſider theſe things, I am full of fears, leſt what is here ſaid, and whatever is ſpoken hereafter, will vaniſh into the air, without any ſucceſſe. However this is ſufficient incouragement to me, that I have born witneſſe to the truth of God in theſe declining times, and hope it may be uſefull, if not for the reduction of ſuch as are gone aſtray, yet for the confirmation and ſettlement of others, who may be wavering herein.

There are three ſorts of Readers, principally which I expect to meet with.

1. Weak and well-minded ſoules, who are in this much to be pitied, that being inſufficient to ſee by their own eyes, and to look through the vail of holy pretences, and pious ends, are apt to be abuſed by others, and to be carried to and fro, by every wind of doctrine: Theſe, I wiſh they had followed the Apoſtles direction, and never given way to doubtfull diſputations. But having once entertained them, and being overthrown by them, if they do not give very diligent heed, and receive not more then ordinary aſſiſtance, are never like to recover themſelves.

2. Proud, wilfull, and ſelf-conceited perſons, the pride of whoſe hearts, hath led them into wayes of ſingularity, and will oblige them to make good their ground. Their Motto is, Cedo nulli. And becauſe a receſſe from their received

perſwaſions

perſwaſions would import ſomething of weakneſſe, and humane frailty, they, being conſcious to themſelves, of their own great worth, are reſolved, and unmoveable from their preſent apprehenſions.

3. *There are an intelligent and ingenuous ſort of men, who being ſenſible of their own weakneſſe, dare not ſuppoſe themſelves beyond a poſſibility of miſtake, and therefore always have an eye open to diſcern further conviction, when ever it is offered, and keep one ear open for the adverſe party, whoſe language is that of* Jobs, That which I know not, teach thou me, and wherein I have thought amiſſe, I will do ſo no more. *It is for the ſake of thoſe, that I have taken this trouble upon my ſelf, and I hope as to perſons of this allay,* my labour may not be in vain in the Lord.

But I ſhall detain thee no longer in the porch, but let thee into the houſe, deſiring the God of Truth, to lead us into all Truth, *which is the hearty prayer of*

Thine in the Lord,

Matthew Poole.

Touching the Relation of the MINISTRY.

CONcerning the Epiſtle prefixed by our Brethren to their Book, I ſhall ſay nothing, becauſe they run out into impertinent Controverſies concerning the *Catholick viſible Church, the matter of a Church, Church Covenant*, &c. And indeed it is needleſſe I ſhould ſay any thing about them, they having been ſo fully ventilated by ſo many Learned Authours, as *Hudſon*, *Rutherford*, *Wood*, *Cawdrey*, and many others; and Dr *Collings* in particular hath Anſwered this Epiſtle, whither I referre the Reader: and therefore I come [illegible] to the Anſwer of the Book.

Wherein I ſhall crave no more liberty then our Brethren took, and I ſhall uſe their own words, *Pag. 1. Though I intend not to Reply to every particular, yet I ſhall give ſuch Animadverſions upon the moſt conſiderable things, as will leave it unneceſſary to ſpeak to the reſt.* This I ſhall ſolemnly promiſe, that I will not willingly decline any thing, which is either ſtrong, or plauſible, or conſiderable, but only ſuch paſſages, as, the foundations being ſhaken, do fall of themſelves: And under this promiſe I hope I may be excuſed from following our Brethren [illegible] (which commonly occaſions perſonal reflections, and

heterogeneous excursions.) And, although it were easie to cast the work into a more convenient mold, yet, that the Reader may with greater ease compare their Book and the Answer, I thought fit to observe their order, and to distinguish it according to their Chapters.

CHAP. I.

1. THey Question, *What is meant by the Ministry?* And here (to passe by impertinencies) *because a Minister is called so from ministration*, they infer, *That gifted men, whose ordinary work or calling is to Preach, may properly be called Ministers of the Gospel*; pag. 3. For my part I shall never blot paper with contending about words: Our Question is not about Names, but Things; And if the word Minister may be applied to twenty persons, we are not concerned in it; for the Question is not, Whether a Gifted brother, whose work or calling is to preach, may be called a Minister: (for even he who never preaches, if he any other way minister to the Gospel, may be called a Minister of the Gospel, according to their own arguments) but Whether such a Gifted brother may preach: and Whether the title Minister, in its special and distinct acception may be applied to him: And in both these we hold the Negative.

2. Their second Question is not much more important, viz. *Whether the Office of the Ministry be a relation to the Work of the Ministry, or to the Church?* And here they tax the Assembly, for saying that *the Office of the Ministry is better defined by relation to the Work, than to a particular people.* Where I desire it may be observed, that the Assembly did not say, The Office of the Ministry is better defined by relation to the Work, than *to the Church in generall*,

ntrall, but *than to a particular Church*: It was not the deſign of the Aſſembly to deny the Miniſtry to be a relation to the Church, nor yet was it their buſineſſe accurately to inſiſt upon the notions of *relate* and *correlate*; they never called the Work of the Miniſtry, the *correlate*, but only *obiter* and ὡς ἐν τύπῳ, they aſſerted the Office of the Miniſtry to be better defined by relation to the Work, than to a particular Church, which our Brethren have not here diſproved; but only endeavoured to prove that the Office of the Miniſtry rather conſiſteth in relation to the Church in general, than to the Work; ſo that all their labour, as to that particular, might have been ſpared. To which may be added, that we muſt diſtinguiſh between the *abſtract* Miniſtry, and the *concrete* a Miniſter.

And although the Miniſter in the *concrete* have the Church for his *Correlatum*, yet that the Miniſtry in the *abſtract* ſhould have relation to the Work, is no more abſurd, then that the Office of a King ſhould have relation to ruling, which, I think, no ſober man will deny; and eſpecially when ſuch a thing is brought in occaſionally by a perſon not minding, nor obliged to minde the ἀκριβολογία of words; it were a vanity in any man to batter down ſuch an expreſſion by a quaternion of Arguments, which our Brethren have attempted to do.

To which may be added, that that rule upon which their firſt Argument hangs, *viz. Relata ſunt ſimul*, & do *mutuo ſe ponere & tollere*, is true only of Predicamentall, but not of Tranſcendentall relations, ſuch as this is; whoſe being is not wholly reſpective, as the Maſters of the Metaphyſicks inform us. Suarez *Metaph.*

And the ſame anſwer alſo may ſerve for the ſecond Argument (which indeed is but the ſame) viz. *That relations muſt be together, but the Office is a means to the Work as an end, and ſo the Office muſt needs be firſt, and therefore*

they are not relatives. To which I anſwer, 1. As before, The rule holds not of Tranſcendentall relations. 2. A potentiall being is ſufficient in relations: My knowledge of a Roſe to be in the ſpring is related to that Roſe even in winter; and yet the Roſe doth not actually, but only potentially exiſt in winter.

The other two Arguments are trivial, and therefore I ſhall dilate no further about them, becauſe this is a Logical and no Theological Controverſie.

CHAP. II. & III.

Qu. *Whether Miniſters are only Miniſters to their particular Flocks?*

IN handling of this I ſhall 1. State the Queſtion plainly and faithfully. 2. I ſhall offer ſome Arguments for the Negative. 3. I ſhall enquire what our Brethren have to ſay for the Affirmative.

For the ſtate of this Queſtion we muſt take notice of another Queſtion, whence it hath its riſe and being, to wit, *Whether beſides particular Congregational Churches, there be any other viſible Political Churches mentioned in Scripture?* It hath till theſe laſt times been univerſally received in the Church of God, that, Beſides that union and communion, whereby the members of a particular Church meet together in a Congregation for the Word and Sacraments, there is another union and communion, whereby particular Churches do by their Delegates (becauſe in their perſons they all cannot) meet together, combine, conſult and conclude in common, as they judge moſt expedient for the good of their particular Churches.

This

This ſufficiently appears from the conſtant practiſe of the Church in all ages, even from the Apoſtles times, *Acts* 15. and ſo downwards; which was, when ever neceſſity required and opportunity was offered, to meet together in Synods, and in common to govern all their Churches. And as theſe meetings were greater or leſſe, ſo they received a differing denomination, being called Synods Oecumenicall, Provincial, *&c.*

And this is at this day the judgement of all the Reformed Churches in the world, ſome few amongſt our ſelves being excepted, and our dear Brethren in *New-England*, both known by the name of *Congregationall men*, ſo called from this their firſt principle, *That the Scripture owns no viſible Church but one Congregation.* From hence it muſt needs follow, according to our Brethrens mind, That Miniſters are Miniſters only to their own Congregations.

As on the other ſide, they that own another Church, beſides Congregational, do aſſert, that Miniſters have a double relation, the one to their own particular Flocks, the other to the whole Church. And thus much for the riſe of the Queſtion.

For our Brethrens mind we ſhall not need to go far, they affirm poſſitively, that *Officers ſtand in relation to a particular Church onely, and they deny them to be Officers to a Church univerſall, or to any but their owne Flocks*, Pag. 8. But here I cannot but take notice of a weighty difference amongſt our Congregational Brethren, in which they ſhould do well to be reconciled before they endeavour too eagerly to obtrude their Notions upon the world; It is this: Mr. *Shepheard* and *Allen* in their anſwer to the nine queſtions aſſert, that *though Miniſters are Officers only to their own Flocks, yet they may perform acts of their Office towards others*, Pag. 133. And Learned Mr. *Norton* in his con-

concludes, that *a Minister preacheth to another Congregation* non tantum virtute donorum & charisatis, sed ex vi vocationis, *&c. i. e.* not only as a gifted Brother, but as an Officer; And it is sufficiently known that it is the judgement of persons of greatest note in that way among us in *England*. Now on the other side, Reverend Mr. *Hooker* expresly affirmeth that *when a minister preacheth to another Congregation, he preacheth not as a Pastour, but as a gifted man*, Survey *Part* 2. *P.*32. And our Brethren in this Book fall in with him, and will not allow Ministers either to be Officers, or to act as Officers towards any, except their owne Congregation.

For the better clearing of the present Question I shall premise two Considerations which indeed do strike at the root of all their Objections.

I. That there are two waies whereby a Minister may be a Minister to the whole Church.

1. *Actu secundo*, actually, immediatly, absolutely and independently, so that he may without any other warrant undertake to teach and govern the whole Church, if it were possible; This was peculiar to the Apostles, and surely this is abundantly sufficient to distinguish them from ordinary Pastors.

2. One may be an Officer to the whole Church *actu primo*, habitually, aptitudinally, mediatly, conditionally, and dependingly, so that he hath a *jus* or power to teach every where (*Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*) but may not exercise that *jus* or power, every where, but by the consent of the Church or Rulers, not as if there was any defect in his authority, but only because there is a manifest inconveniency and disorder in such a promiscuous and unlicensed exercise, which therfore is unlawful because it is repugnant to Order, and obstructive to Edification: and this is the case of ordinary Pastors.

II. I shall

II. I ſhall premiſe another Conſideration, which being well digeſted is ſufficient to enervate all that is ſaid by our Brethren as to this point: it is this, A generall reſpect to the whole Church is not inconſiſtent with a peculiar reſpect to ſome one Church.

Suppoſe one having a vaſt number of ſheep, needeth and chuſeth twenty Shepheards to look to his ſheep, and theſe ſhepheards becauſe each of them cannot poſſibly look to all, do therefore diſtribute the ſheep into twenty parcels, and each undertakes to look to his ſhare, yet ſo, as that in things of common concernment to all the ſheep, they all meet and conſult together, *&c.* but in matters of private concernment every man looks to his own parcel: In this caſe every ſhepheard hath a double relation, the one general to the whole, the other particular to his own parcel, which he doth more eſpecially take care for, and feed, and keep, and watch over, *&c.* And in caſe any of thoſe ſheep which properly belong not to his charge go aſtray, if he ſee them and can keep them in, he is obliged by vertue of his office to do it, and if through his neglect they miſcarry, he doth not only ſin againſt Charity but againſt his Office. This is the caſe of the Church, and ſo it was out of doubt with the Apoſtles, unto whom Chriſt committed the care of his ſheep indefinitely: And becauſe each of them could not look to all, therefore the ſheep were divided into parcels, and every Apoſtle takes upon himſelf a ſpecial relation unto ſome one parcel, and had his proper line, 2 *Cor.*10. And becauſe the ſheep multiplied ſo faſt, that to look to them all was a work too heavy for the Apoſtles ſhoulders, therefore the Flock was divided into more parcels, and they ordained more ſhepheards, who although peculiarly entruſted with their proper Charge, yet were not freed from their Care of the whole, but in things of common concernment did meet together

together with the Apoſtles in their daies, *Act.* 15. And afterwards among themſelves.

Or as it is in *Germany*, where every Elector and Prince of the Empire ſuſtains a double relation; He is related more eſpecially to his owne peculiar Territory to which he is an Officer, acting ordinarily, and conſtantly, *&c.* But over and beſides his, he hath a general relation to the whole Empire, and is an Officer to the whole, not ſingly and by himſelf, but together with others, being intruſted with a joint-power of governing the whole, as in caſe of chuſing of an Emperor, or other weighty affairs of the Empire, as the neceſſities and occaſions of the Empire require. Juſt ſo it is in the Church, which is one entire body (as the Empire is) governed by one Syſteme of laws, and molded under one Government, every Miniſter hath a double relation, the one ſpecial and peculiar, to his owne Flock which he is to feed conſtantly; the other general to the whole Church, which he is to feed occaſionally, as far as his ability will reach, and as the Churches exigencies command, and which he together with others hath a power to govern.

This will be put out of doubt by conſidering more fully that which even now was intimated of the Apoſtles themſelves, who alſo had this double relation, one to the whole, whereby they were Paſtors of the whole Church, and yet becauſe they could not poſſibly each of them look to all the Churches, therefore the work was divided among them, and they undertook a ſpecial relation to ſome particular parts, as *Peter* to the Jews, and *Paul* to the Gentiles, *James* to *Jeruſalem*, &c. Which diviſion did not proceed from any defect of authority in the Apoſtles to feed the whole, but from the impoſſibility of the thing in regard of the vaſtneſſe of the work, and becauſe they were to carry on all Church-work as moſt ſuited with edification.

In

In like manner we that are ordinary Paſtors, *ſequimur patres, non paſſibus æquis*; and though every Miniſter is a Miniſter of the whole Church, and hath an Authority extending to it *ſuo modo*, yet becauſe it is impoſſible for every one to look to every Church, and all things are to be managed with ſpecial reſpect to the Churches edification, therefore Miniſters are forced to divide the work, both as to Teaching and Ruling; yet ſo, as that there ſtill remains a relation to the whole, whereby he is obliged to teach, and with others to rule other Churches, ſo far forth as his ability reacheth, and the Churches neceſſities require.

And by the way, I cannot but take notice of a remarkable difference between Teaching and Ruling, in point of the poſſibility of the thing, and the edification of the Church (which is the great Rule in all Church-adminiſtrations) for a Miniſter may jointly with others rule a far greater proportion than he can teach. *David* as a King, could rule all *Iſrael*, but *David* as a Prophet, could not *vivâ voce*, teach all *Iſrael*, at leaſt not ordinarily and conſtantly. And the Apoſtles, though it was impoſſible for every one of them actually to teach every Church, (they neither could do it, nor did it) yet it was poſſible for each Apoſtle joyntly with the reſt, to govern every Church, and they did actually rule all the Churches, at leaſt all the Churches there mentioned, in that famous Synod, *Acts* 15. (in which, whether they acted as Apoſtles, or as ordinary Elders, all is one to the preſent Queſtion.) And this may ſerve for Anſwer to that ſpecious Argument ſo much inſiſted on by the Reverend and Learned diſſenters, taken from the conjunction of Teaching and Ruling.

Theſe things premiſed, I ſhall now come to the Arguments: And here I ſhall have a double work;

1. To lay down an Argument or two, to prove that Miniſters are Officers, and act as Officers to more than their own particular Churches.

2. To Anſwer their Arguments, and to juſtifie thoſe inconveniences objected by the Provincial Aſſembly to the contrary Opinion.

For the former, I ſhall not here dilate, only I ſhall propound three Arguments.

The firſt Argument is this, *If Miniſters are Officers, and act as Officers towards convertible Heathens, then they are not Officers only to their particular Congregations: But Miniſters are Officers, and act as Officers towards convertible Heathens.* The *Minor* is the only Propoſition that can be denied, and that I ſhall now endeavour to prove.

1. The caſe is plain in the Apoſtles: That Apoſtles were conſtituted Officers before the viſible Goſpel-Church was erected, is undeniable, and appears plainly from *Mat.* 28. The Apoſtles, at that time, were Officers for they had actually received their Commiſſion; they being *relata*, muſt have a *correlatum*: A *correlate* there was none, but thoſe who were to be made Diſciples, who were to be converted: So that, one of theſe two muſt neceſſarily be granted, either that the Apoſtolical relation wanted a *correlatum* (which to ſay, is groſly abſurd) or that the Heathens and Jews to be converted, were the *correlatum* to them.

There is but one thing that can be ſaid, to wit, that at that time there were divers already converted Chriſtians, who were a ſufficient *correlatum* to the Apoſtolical Office. To which I Anſwer, If we ſuppoſe that all ſuch Chriſtians had died, or forſaken the profeſſion of the Faith, (which might have fallen out without any detriment to the perpetuity of the Church, ſeeing the eſſence of the Church had been preſerved in the Apoſtles, if they only had

had continued in the faith) I ſay, ſuppoſe they all had thus fallen away, yet had the Apoſtles been Officers, and therefore the Heathens had been their *correlatum*.

2. And ſuch indeed are clearly expreſſed, *Matth.* 28. 19,20. to be the primary and immediate object of the Apoſtolical Office and relation. From whence will follow, that a Miniſter may be a Miniſter, though he have no particular Church to which he ſtands related: Juſt as the Eunuch was a member of the Church viſible, though there was no particular Church into which he was admitted, *Acts* 8.

The only probable Anſwer which I can apprehend is this, That the Argument no way holds from Apoſtles to ordinary Miniſters: But in this caſe I conceive it doth. For,

1. The Apoſtles as well as Paſtors (ſay our Brethren) are Officers only to the Church. *Chap.* 3. *p.* 18. they ſay of Miniſters, *That it is lawfull for them to go and preach to unbelievers*; and they inſtance in the Apoſtles preaching to Heathens, *Acts* 11. & 16. *and yet* (ſay they) *they are no Officers to ſuch unbelievers*: Whereby it is plain that they deny not only ordinary Paſtors, but alſo Apoſtles to be Officers to Heathens; which alſo further appears by the reaſon they adde, why ſuch Miniſters are no Officers to Heathens (which is common to Apoſtles with other Miniſters) viz. *Becauſe they cannot as Officers exerciſe Church-government towards them*; which holds true even of the Apoſtles; *What have we to do to judge them that are without*, 1 Cor. 5. Now if the Apoſtles, who were (according to our Brethren) only Church-officers, yet acted as Officers towards ſuch as were wholly without the Church, and towards Heathens, much more is it true of ordinary Paſtors, that, albeit they are Officers in ſpecial to their particular Flock, yet they are Officers, and

act as Officers, towards other Churches.

2. Apostles and Pastors are paralleld in this case, *Eph.* 4.11,12. *And he gave some Apostles ——— and some Pastors and Teachers, For the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.* From whence it is most evident, that the object of the Apostolical and Pastoral Office is one and the same, both of them being by Office related to the Saints, not only that are actually brought in, but also to those that are to be gathered: And the Offices were appointed, and the Officers bestowed for this very end, *for the edifying of the body of Christ:* By which Body of Christ, we must with judicious Interpreters, necessarily understand the whole collection of all Christs members in all ages of the Church, all which, in Scripture phrase, go to the making up of Christs body, so that if one of them were lacking, Jesus Christ should want his fulnesse (as he is pleased to express himself) *Eph.* 1.21.

And answerably to this the word οἰκοδομὴ, or edifying, is not to be understood, as in some other places, for building up of such as are brought in only, but also for the bringing in of those who are yet without; for that indeed was the great end why the Ministry was instituted, *Mat.* 28.19,20. And the very phrase of building, implies as well the gathering together of stones for the building, and the laying of the foundation, as the raising up of the building; and the nature of the body, as we have now explained it, necessarily requires, that this edifying should be understood extensively, as well as intensively.

I shall contract all this into a short Syllogism, The body of Christ in its latitude is the *correlatum*, or the object of the Pastoral Office; But the body of Christ includes Heathens: Therefore Heathens to be converted are the object and *correlate* of the Pastoral Office. The *major* is plain.

plain from the Text, and what hath been ſaid; the *minor* alſo is no leſſe evident, that Heathens are a part of Chriſts body: They are called his ſheep, *John* 10. 16. *Other ſheep I have which are not of this fold.* Heathens to be converted Chriſt laid down his life for (elſe they had never been converted) and yet he laid down his life only for *his body*, *Eph.* 5. And therefore they are his members and part of his body, and therefore they are the object and *correlate* of the Paſtoral Office.

Predeſtinati nondum congregati. Aug.

And as the whole Church in all ages (to wit, including perſons yet uncalled, but by election belonging to it) is the *correlatum* of the Miniſters and Miniſterial Office in all ages, ſo the whole Church in one age (including ſuch as by predeſtination, though not yet by actual vocation and congregation, belong to it) is the *correlate* of the Miniſters and Miniſterial Office in that one age: So that not only a particular Church is the *correlate* of a Miniſter, but alſo ſuch as are not yet members of any particular Church, nor of any Church at all.

The ſecond Argument may be taken from 2 *Cor.* 5. 20. where the reconcilable world, which conſiſts of ſuch as are yet without and no members of the Church, are made the chief object and *correlatum* of the Office of the Miniſtry; and from thence I ſhall thus argue, *To whom Miniſters act as Ambaſſadours, to them they act as Officers: But Miniſters preach as Ambaſſadours to Heathens convertible and to be converted, Ergo.* The Propoſition is evident from the terms, To be an Ambaſſadour, is nothing elſe but to be an Officer; and it may receive further light and ſtrength from this conſideration, that Miniſters are not Ambaſſadors *a pari ad parem*, from one King to another as equal, but *a ſuperiori ad inferiorem*, from one ſuperiour in authority to all; from a Prince to his ſubjects, whom he is calling in; from one who may and doth require all

Heathens, as well as others, to hear and obey his Ambassadors, I mean from the Lord Christ. For the Assumption, that Ministers preaching to Heathens, do preach as Ambassadors (where all the doubt lies) I proceed to make good

1. If the Scripture makes no difference between a Ministers preaching to his own Church and to others, then there is no difference, *Ubi lex non distinguit, non est distinguendum.* But the Scripture makes no difference, *&c.* Wherever a Minister preacheth, he is to preach *with all Authority.* Strangers are as well obliged to obey him as his own people.

2. Even Heathens are bound to hear Ministers preaching to them, and that not only *ex vi materiæ*, because of the matter they treat of, but *virtute muneris*, by vertue of their Office. *He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me*, Luke 10. 16. And therefore as the Jews and Heathens were bound to hear Christ, not only in regard of his message which he brings, but also in respect of his Office, as he was the Mediator and the great Prophet in the Church, *Deut.* 18. 15, 19. So also it is with Ministers, who act as in Christs stead, they are to be heard even by Heathens, for their Office sake, as well as for their Doctrine. And those Jews or Heathens which disobeyed the Doctrine of the Apostles, are not only charged with the guilt of rejecting the truth, but also of contemning the Persons and Offices of the Apostles, which could not have been, if the Apostles had not preached as Officers to such. And surely it must needs be reputed strange doctrine, to say, that a Minister, yea an Apostle, preaching to Heathens, doth preach no more authoritatively, than any woman or child that is occasionally discoursing to such of the things of God. The Apostles might challenge Maintenance of those Heathens to whom they

they preached, *Mat.* 10. 10. 1 *Cor.* 9. which such women and children could not pretend to; which clearly demonstrates that the Apostles preached not as gifted persons, but as Officers to them. The Apostles preaching to such had a power authoritatively to pronounce pardon, or to denounce wrath to them, upon their believing or disobeying, (which are the two acts of the Keys) and which to do requires an Office-relation to them.

If it be objected that this may be true of the Apostles, that they were Ambassadors, and preached as Ambassadors to Heathens, and yet not true of ordinary Pastours. I answer, either ordinary ministers are Ambassadors, or else Christ hath not had any Ambassadors in the world since the daies of the Apostles, But Christ hath had, and hath Ambassadors still in the world, therefore Ministers are ordinary Ambassadors; the *Minor* is plain, for if only extraordinary Officers be Ambassadors, then where there are no such extraordinary Officers, there are no Ambassadors. The *Minor* also is as cleer, that the Office of Gospel Ambassadors was a continuing Ordinance, and it is most ridiculous to think, that while the design and work of the Ambassador lasts, his Office should not continue, and besides, Christ hath perpetuated the Office, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. If he said they are Ambassadors indeed, but it is to their own people, not to Heathens. I answer, yea rather they are Ambassadors to Heathens: for as the great work of other Ambassadors is to make peace, so also Gospel Ambassadors their great business is to beseech men to be reconciled to God, and therefore their principal object is not the Church who are already supposed to be reconciled, but Heathens and Strangers who are yet unreconciled: and seeing ordinary Ministers preaching to Heathens, have a power upon their repentance to remit sin, *Jo.* 20. To declare their sins remit-

remitted officially, it must needs follow, that they are Ambassadors to such: And the Apostle in this place ascribes both the name and work of Ambassadors unto ordinary Ministers, speaking in the plural number, *We then as Ambassadors*, &c. And he attributes the name to himself, upon a ground common with him to ordinary Ministers, *i.e.* because he besought them as in Christs stead to be reconciled to God: and as we rightly infer the assurance of salvation of ordinary believers from the Apostles assurance, because he fixeth his assurance not upon any peculiar revelation, but upon grounds common to all Christians; so may we that are ordinary Ministers, justly take to our selves the Name and Office of Ambassadors, because the Apostles assum'd it upon such grounds as are common to all Ministers: and not upon such as are peculiar to the Apostolical Dignity.

And this may suffice for the enforcement of this second argument: but there is one block that must be removed. It is plausibly objected by Mr. *Allen* and Mr. *Shepheard*, in there answer to the nine Questions, *That Ministers, though Officers to their own Flock, yet may do the acts of their Office towards others, as a Steward of an house acteth as an Officer in the entertainment of strangers*, &c. *And thus Ministers may preach as Officers to others, and yet be only Officers to their own Congregations.* To this I answer, 1. This concerns not our Brethren here, who do positively determine, that Ministers preaching to others, do preach only as gifted men, not as Officers, p. 18. So that I might without disparagement wave this Objection. 2. This is a meer fallacy, the resemblance it self is misunderstood or mis-applied: for a Steward of an house, it is true, he acts as a Steward in the entertainment of strangers, but how? he acts as the Steward of that house, not as a Steward to them whom he entertains: But a Minister

preacheth

preacheth as an Officer with authority, not only in relation to his own Church, but any others that occaſionally hear him, as hath been proved. And yet 3. If the ſimilitude were well laid, there is a further diſſimilitude in the caſe in hand; for a Steward of an houſe is a Steward only to that particular Family, but Miniſters are Stewards to the whole Church, all which is called one family, and one houſhold, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *How thou ſhouldſt behave thy ſelf in the houſe of God.* Gal. 6. 10. *Do good to all, eſpecially the houſhold of faith.* Eph. 2. 19. *You are fellow Citizens of the Saints, and of the houſhold of God.* And the reaſon why the Steward of an houſe is no Officer to ſtrangers, is becauſe the Lord that makes him a Steward hath no authority to make him a Steward over ſtrangers, nor further then his houſe or juriſdiction reacheth. But Chriſt, who makes Miniſters Stewards, hath authority to make them ſuch over the whole Church, yea, over Heathens; and indeed ſo he hath done, as the former Arguments have proved: and he requires of the world to own his Miniſters as Ambaſſadors, and will ſeverely puniſh their rejection and contempt of them.

The third and laſt argument ſhall be this; *If the converſion of Heathens, &c. be the principal ground and end why the Office of the Miniſtry was inſtituted, and the principal work of the Miniſtry, then the Office of the Miniſtry is related to Heathens: But the converſion of Heathens, &c. is the principal end why the Office of the Miniſtry was inſtituted, and the principal work of the Miniſtry ſo inſtituted, Therefore the Office of the Miniſtry is related to Heathens.* For the *major* it is evident from the very terms; every Miniſter is unqueſtionably related to thoſe among whom his work lies. And as it is plain in Chriſt Jeſus, our great Biſhop, that the Church or his ſheep, are his *correlatum*, becauſe his end and his work was their ſalvation; ſo alſo muſt it

needs be in Miniſters, that their relation muſt be towards thoſe among whom their great work lies. For the *minor* no man can doubt of it that hath read the Scriptures, eſpecially thoſe fore-cited places, *Mat.*28. & *Eph.*4.

If it be ſaid, Converſion indeed was the great work of the Apoſtles, but not ſo of ordinary Miniſters; thoſe were to build up what the Apoſtles brought in:

I anſwer 1. Both thoſe places do evidently relate as well to ordinary Miniſters, as to the Apoſtles: For *Eph.*4. they are equally named; and for *Mat.*28. it is clear, becauſe thoſe Miniſters who are there ſpoken of, and ſet apart for that work of the converſion of Heathens, they are aſſured by God that they ſhall continue to the end of the world, which is not true of the Apoſtles in their own perſons, unleſſe to them you adde their ſucceſſors, the ordinary Miniſters. And 1 *Cor.*3.5. *Who is Paul, and who is Apollo*, &c. *but Miniſters by whom ye believe.* And that text will continue true to the end of the world, *Faith comes by hearing*, Rom.10. of ordinary Miniſters, as well as the Apoſtles.

2. If converſion be a work common and neceſſary in theſe daies, as well as in the Apoſtles daies, then Miniſters are now appointed for that work as well as formerly they were: For while the cauſe and reaſon remains, the effect alſo muſt needs remain: But converſion is a work common and neceſſary now as well as then; For though men are not Heathens now as they were formerly, yet many are but profeſſors and titular Chriſtians, by vertue of their Church-memberſhip, and ſo do need a work of converſion.

3. Either the ordinary Miniſters of the Church were appointed for converſion, or elſe Chriſt hath appointed no Officers to take care of the greateſt and moſt principal work, which is the converſion of ſinners: But this is highly

highly abſurd that Chriſt ſhould take leaſt care, where there was moſt need: and therefore ordinary Miniſters were inſtituted for converſion.

And thus I have done with the firſt thing, which was to prove, that *Miniſters are Officers and act as Officers to others beſides their own Congregation.*

The ſecond thing propounded was, To Anſwer their Arguments, and to vindicate the Arguments offered by the Provincial Aſſembly againſt that contrary opinion, that *Miniſters are Officers only to their own Congregations.*

And for the better methodizing of it, I ſhall firſt with all brevity propound the Aſſemblies Arguments, then our Brethrens Anſwers, and then adde a Reply: And this I chuſe to do in this place, although theſe things are diſcuſſed by them under another Head, *p.*227, *&c.* becauſe they properly concern this Queſtion. But I ſhall paſſe them over with more brevity, becauſe it is but a collateral Queſtion, and our Brethren are leſſe accurate in this, than in the other point.

1. *This opinion is unheard of in the Church of Chriſt, before theſe late years.* Provinc.

Anſ. *It ſufficeth that it is heard of in the Scripture.*

Reply. But you know that is denied; and for the Churches judgement, as it is not to be advanced into Gods throne, ſo it is not eaſily to be ſlighted, where there is an univerſall conſent of all Churches (as there is in this caſe) which it is hard to ſhew in any Errour: *Nemo pacificus contra Eccleſiam.*

2. *This opinion is contrary to our Brethrens practiſe, who hold the adminiſtration of the Sacrament to be a Miniſteriall act, and yet give it to members of other Congregations.* Provinc.

To this there is a double Anſwer given by our Brethren.

1. The main Anſwer where they lay moſt ſtreſſe, which therefore I propoſe firſt, is this, that *In miniſterial acts ſome things are common to men as men, as the Word and Prayer; ſome are common to them as Church members, or as confederates with any particular Church, not conſidering this or another Church, as the Sacraments; other things as ſpecial and proper to a particular Church,* &c. *as Excommunication, Election,* &c. *So that a man may claim the Sacrament as a confederate with any Church: And as a father giving inſtruction to his children and ſervants, teacheth them as a Father and Maſter; but, if ſtrangers come in and partake of the inſtruction, he teacheth them not by vertue of any ſuch relation; ſo if a Paſtor preach and give the Sacrament occaſionally, he acts not as a Paſtor and Officer to them.* This is the ſtrength of what our Brethren ſay, *p.*278,279,280.

Reply 1. If our Brethren perceive not how they have overſhot themſelves, I queſtion not but any judicious Reader will quickly diſcern it, how they are fallen from their own principles. Indeed the Anſwer were tolerable, if preaching and giving the Sacrament were of the ſame nature and quality, and did proceed *pari paſſu*, but ſeeing it is generally granted by our Congregational Brethren, That Preaching is not alwaies an act of Office, and that it is an act which may be done by Gifted men; and that the adminiſtration of the Sacrament is alwaies an act of Office, and cannot be done but by one in Office, it is moſt incongruouſly done to jumble theſe two together, and to make them alike in this very caſe where they acknowledge the difference.

2. To the Sacrament two things are required, which are warily to be diſtinguiſhed; 1. A *right* in the Receiver to claim, and that indeed we have in the ſuppoſed caſe, according to our Brethrens principles. 2. A *power* in the Giver to adminiſter, and this none hath but an Officer, and

and none can do it but as an Officer, and therefore no man can give it to any, but to them to whom he is an Officer, and acts as an Officer, and therefore they cannot give it to any member of other Congregations.

And this acute Mr. *Hooker* is ſo ſenſible of, that he grants it in *terminis*, uſing theſe words; *Touching the partaking of the Sacrament by ſome of one Congregation in another, it hath been a courſe which I have ever queſtioned, and againſt it I have alledged many Arguments, profeſſing the courſe unwarrantable, for this reaſon (among others) becauſe the adminiſtration of the Sacrament is a Miniſterial act, and cannot be done but by a Paſtor or Teacher, and what authority hath he to do it, and they to receive it from him to whom he is no Paſtor*; as he is cited by *Cawdry, Inconſiſtency of Indep. Way*, p. 203. Nor do I ſee how this can be fairly avoided by any that ſtick to Congregational principles, and I think ſuch a ſtrange paradox as this, aſſerted by ſo conſiderable a perſon, and flowing from ſuch principles, may juſtly render them ſuſpected to all impartial judges.

And whereas our Brethren here imply the contrary, and talk of *a Paſtors giving the Sacrament to ſtrangers not as a Paſtor*; 1. Let all men take notice that in this they have deſerted their own principles, and have through incogitancy precipitated themſelves into the gulf of Anabaptiſm, which, I doubt not, in their next, either their prudence or their ingenuity will oblige them to retract. 2. The Provincial Aſſembly were not obliged to take notice of the excentrical opinions of every particular Congregational man, but of thoſe which were owned by the generality of them, and by ſuch as ſeemed to be Pillars among them; and ſure I am, ſuch will reject this notion of a mans giving the Sacrament as a Gifted brother. They know the rule, *Quod competit rei qua tali competit omni tali*; If a Paſtor gives the Sacrament to ſtrangers not as a

Paſtor or Officer, but as a Gifted brother (for that is the other member of the diſtinction) then every Gifted brother may adminiſter the Sacrament, which I ſuppoſe our Brethren will tremble to grant, and therefore they muſt call back their own words too loaſely delivered.

2. *But however* (ſay they) *this is an argument againſt our practiſe, not the aſſertion.*

Reply. Yes, it may give juſt cauſe of ſuſpicion of the truth of that aſſertion, which inevitably draws along with it ſuch a ſtrange concluſion as this, that no man may receive the Sacrament any where but in his own Congregation, which is in a great meaſure to cut the ſinews of Chriſtian and Church-communion; and yet for ought either I or Mr *Hooker* ſee, either this concluſion muſt be embraced, or the principle rejected.

I paſſe on to the Reaſons. *There are* (ſay the Aſſembly) *ſeven ill conſequences which follow this aſſertion, That a Miniſter can perform no Paſtorall act out of his own Congregation:* I ſhall reduce them to two or three.

1. *Then a Miniſter at the ſame time preacheth to his own members as a Miniſter, and to others as a Gifted man only.*

2. *Then a Miniſter baptizeth only into his own Congregation, not into the Catholick Church, contrary to* 1 Cor. 12. 13. *and ſo a Miniſter can baptize none but thoſe that are members of his own Congregation, and ſo there is no way to baptize Heathens converted, nor the children of ſuch parents as cannot be members of any Congregation.* And here our Brethren bring in that Argument mentioned by the Provinc. *That a Miniſter Miniſterially admits into and ejects out of the Church-Catholick, and therefore is a Miniſter of the Church-Catholick, and not only of his particular Congregation,* p. 281, &c.

Let us now hear what our Brethren have to Anſwer.

1. They ſay, *We ſee no abſurdity in ſaying that a Miniſter*

ster preacheth to some as an Officer, and at the same time preacheth to others not as an Officer.

Reply 1. This is a conceit for which there is no shadow in the Scripture: Nay it is not only ἄνεφον but ἀντίγραφον, not only *without*, but *against* the evidence of Scripture. Ministers wherever, or to whomsoever they do the work of Ambassadors, whomsoever they beseech to be reconciled, to them they act as Ambassadors: And whose sins soever they remit Doctrinally (which is an act of Office) they are remitted; and whose sins soever they retain, in preaching, they are retained, whether their hearers be strangers, or of their own Congregation: And this they do by vertue of their Office. Surely it is very harsh to say that all strangers which hear a Minister, are no more bound to hear and obey him, then to hear or obey any woman discoursing privately of those things; and that a stranger rejecting his message, is no way guilty of the contempt of his Office, (it will be an happy thing if that will be a sufficient plea at the last day.) Nay by this rule the very Apostles themselves (as we have more largely seen) must, when preaching to Heathens, be canton'd into the order of Gifted men; and if that be true, it was no act of their Office to disciple Nations, and to gather in the Saints: And all those Heathens which are now converted by Ministers, are not converted by vertue of the Ministers Office, nor was the Office of the Ministry appointed for the gathering in of souls, but only for the building up of such as are brought in, contrary to *Mat.* 28. & *Eph.* 4. as hath been argued.

2. They argue against that position, *That a man is made a member of the Church by Baptism*, p. 284. whereas indeed it is none of our assertion, and so all that labour, both of theirs and Mr *Hookers* is lost. They cannot but know that we allow Infants to be born Church-members,

and

and make their Church-membership the ground of their Baptism, and *a par*, a Heathen converted, and professing the faith, is a Church-member *inchoatè* before Baptism; this only we say, That the solemn, publick and visible way of admission of members into the Church, is by Baptism; and this cannot be easily denied by any one that looks either to the Jewish or Christian Church: For as since the New Testament began, it hath alwaies been the door of admission, so was it also unto Proselytes in the Old Testament, who used to be admitted into the Jewish Church by Baptism, as divers Learned Men have proved. Or if our Brethren question that, yet at least, Circumcision (to which our Baptism answers) was the door of admission into the Jewish Church. But of this more hereafter.

right not. Hammond. Selden.

3. They deny that a Minister ejects out of the Catholick Church. *Not the Minister, but the person renouncing his profession ejects himself out of it; He may be ejected with, and not by Excommunication. And how can a mans being ejected out of a particular Church, make him no member of the Catholick Church; if being ejected out of Office in a particular Church, doth not make a man no Officer to the Catholick visible Church.* p. 285.

Reply 1. Here two things are opposed which may be conjoyned; For both the person ejects himself, and the Minister ejects him: He ejects himself meritoriously, the Minister efficiently and juridically.

2. Either a Minister ejecting a man justly out of his own Church, ejects him out of all other Churches (and that cannot be but by vertue of a Catholick Church, *&c.*) or he is not juridically ejected out of other Churches, and so he is in a capacity of being received into other Churches, (which what horrid confusion it would introduce into the Church of God, and how incongruous it is unto

unto his wiſdom, *in whom are hid all the treaſures of wiſdom and knowledge*, to appoint a remedy ſo ſhort and inſufficient for the diſeaſe, I leave to all ſober men to judge.) And this is not a bare ſuggeſtion, for experience ſhews that the effect of this principle is ſuch, and perſons juridically and juſtly ejected out of one Church, have been admitted into another Church (who it may be, apprehend him to have been unjuſtly dealt with) and according to this principle there is no remedy, but ſo it muſt be.

3. For the ejecting of Officers, I ſay, 1. That a Church in their ſenſe, *i. e.* the body of the people, hath no power of ejecting of Officers, as our Brethren ſuppoſe. 2. That when a Miniſter is juridically ejected out of Office in a particular Church by depoſition, he ceaſeth to be an Officer to the Catholick Church.

4. They ſay, *according to our way alſo we cannot baptize Heathens, for if there be a Catholick Church, Miniſters are only Officers in the Church, and not to the Heathens converted, ſo cannot baptize them.*

Reply. Miniſters are Officers not only to thoſe that are actually members of the Church, but to all that ſhall be brought in, as we have ſhewn; they are Officers even to Heathens, in the ſenſe before explained, as they do *ex officio* offer them a pardon, and give it upon their repentance, ſo they do *ex officio* admit them into the Church.

5. They ſay, *in ſuch a caſe Heathens may joyn as members to ſome Church, and ſo be baptized.*

Reply. Our Brethren ſhould not obtrude ſuch uncouth notions upon the world without evident proof. Their anſwer implies as if there were ſome other way whereby a man might be made a compleat Church-member, without Baptiſm, whereas in Scripture there is *ne γε quidem* of any other door of admiſſion: If there be, let our Bre-

thren shew it, for we are the New Testament way was by Baptism. But of this more by and by.

And this is all of any moment which our Brethren have to say by way of Answer to the foregoing Argument.

3. Another Argument used by the Provincial Assembly, was this, that *From hence it will follow, that when a Minister leaves, or is put from his particular Charge, he ceaseth to be a Minister; and so when he taketh up a new Charge, he needs a new Ordination, which is absurd, because every Minister is seated in the Catholick Church,* 1 Cor. 12. Eph. 4. *And as a private Christian removing from his Church, doth not cease to be a member of the visible Church (for then his Baptism should cease, for every baptized person is a Church-member) and needs not to be baptized a new; so a Minister going from a Congregation, needs not to be Ordained a new.*

To this our Brethren Answer divers things.

1. They say, *This runs into direct Anabaptism, for by this rule, an Excommunicate person ceasing to be a member, his Baptism ceaseth, and so he needs to be re-baptized when he is re-admitted.* p. 292.

Reply I. But this followeth not for a double reason.

1. It may be said, that an Excommunicate person ordinarily is a member, though a diseased member, 2 *Thess.* 3. —*Admonish him as a brother.* He towards whom I owe the duty of a fellow-member, is a fellow-member: But I owe the duty of a fellow-member, *viz.* fraternal admonition to such an one. Again, He who is under a Church Ordinance appointed for his good, is a Church-member, though diseased, and under cure: But such an one is under an Ordinance, *Ergo.*

2. Though his Baptism ceaseth at present actually and really, as to all the actual priviledges of it, and so ceaseth, that

that while he repents not, he is to be looked upon after a sort, as an unbaptized person, or as an Heathen; yet when he doth repent and renew his Covenant, and re-admit himself to the Church, he needs no new Baptism, for as much as God is pleased to impute to him his former Baptism, and the Church accepts of it; And this is the benefit of his repentance, that God looks upon his sins repented of, as if they had never been committed, and so in that case he looks on him, as if he had never fallen from his Baptism; and so he needs no new one: Just as it was in the case of Circumcision, when any turned Heathen or Idolater, and renounced his Circumcision, he was to be reputed as an Heathen, while such; and yet whenever he repented, he needed no new Circumcision, but his former Circumcision was accepted by God for him.

II. The Argument fals upon our Brethrens principles, not upon ours: For to us (who assert that Baptism is the door of admission into the Catholick Church) it is uncontroverted, that a man removing from one Church, may be admitted to any other, because his Baptism gave him a compleat visible and political membership, not only with that Church he was admitted into, but with all others: And this membership and Baptism, though they were lost in the sense before spoken, yet upon his repentance are recovered. But our Brethren, who make Baptism only the door of admission into a particular Church, they must own this conclusion, That upon every removal there must be a new Baptism. Even as it is in civil Corporations, which because they are distinct from one another, and there is no general Corporation of which each of these are members, therefore whenever a member passeth from one to another, he needs to be admitted a new, by what way soever they use in the admission of members. And to save them from this intollerable inconvenience,

they have no shelter but one, which comes in the next place.

2. They say, *Baptism doth not admit, or make a man to stand in relation to any Church, either general or particular, but it is a solemn sign of a persons taking the Name of Christ upon him, and therefore that remains wherever he removes.* pag. 293.

Reply 1. Our Brethren granted even now, that Baptism was a sign of a mans admission to the Church.

2. This may well stand with its being a sign of a persons taking the Name of Christ, nay indeed it is the same thing in substance, for what is a Church but a company of men professing the Name of Christ? and what then is it to be a solemn sign of a mans admission into the Church, but to be a solemn sign of his being a professor of the Name of Christ?

3. What a monstrous paradox is this, *Baptism makes not a man to stand in relation to any Church?* This should not have been dictated without any proof, but demonstrated by clear evidences, it being against the judgement of the whole Church. Surely the Apostle was not of this mind, when he said, *We are all baptized into one body,* 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. By which it is most evident, that Baptism gives a man relation to some Body, and it is also plain that he speaks of a visible body, because it is an organical body, having the distinction of *teachers* and *taught*, &c. And this Body, if it be the Church Catholick, (as we say, and as the place proves, for as much as Jews and Gentiles are all members of it) then we have our desire: If it be a Church particular, then Baptism makes us to stand in relation to such a Church. And if this were meant of the invisible body, and this Baptism of internal Baptism, yet it rationally follows, that as the inward Baptism makes a man stand in relation to the invisible Church,

Church, ſo doth the external Baptiſm make him ſtand in relation to the viſible Church. Again, That which makes a man viſibly ſtand in relation to Chriſt, that makes him viſibly to ſtand in relation to the Church: But Baptiſm makes a man viſibly to ſtand in relation to Chriſt, *Ergo.* The *major* is plain, becauſe the Church and the Church only, and the members of it, ſtand in viſible relation to Chriſt: The *minor* is evident from *Rom 6.3. Know ye not that ſo many of us as were baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, were baptized into his death.* Gal.3.27. *For as many of you as have been baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt*; Therefore Baptiſm makes a man ſtand in relation to the Church. Again, That which makes a man viſibly to ſtand in a Covenant relation, makes a man to ſtand in relation to a Church: But Baptiſm makes a man viſibly to ſtand in a Covenant relation; *Ergo.* The *major* cannot be denied, becauſe of the identity of a Covenant and Church relation: All and only they that are really in Covenant, are really members of the inviſible Church: And all and only ſuch as are viſibly in Covenant, are members of the viſible Church: The *minor* muſt needs be granted by every one that underſtands the nature of Baptiſm: Baptiſm is the ſeal of the Covenant, and to ſay the ſeal of the Covenant makes not a man to ſtand in relation to the Covenant, is a contradiction. Laſtly, That which makes a man capable of Church-priviledges, makes him ſtand in relation to a Church: But Baptiſm makes a man capable of Church-priviledges, *v.g.* of the Supper, *&c.* (which unbaptized perſons are not capable of) *Ergo* it makes a man ſtand in relation to a Church. So then this paradox being diſproved (that I may reduce theſe things to my main ſcope) and it being evident that Baptiſm makes a man ſtand in relation to ſome Church, and that viſible too (which all grant) it remains either that

there is a Catholick viſible Church, to which Baptiſm makes a man to ſtand related; or if the Church into which it admits a man be only a particular Church, then upon every removal, there muſt be, as a new admiſſion, ſo a new Baptiſm.

3. They ſay, *An Officer may be ſaid to be ſet in the whole Church, though his authority reacheth only to a part: as it may be ſaid, There are ſet in the Commonwealth, Juſtices, Conſtables, &c. and yet this proves not that beſides their relation to their Precincts, they have a relation to the Commonwealth, and a power to act there.*

Reply 1. That phraſeology ſufficiently implies that the Commonwealth, wherein they are ſet, is one Political body, and ſo *a pari*, that phraſe, *God hath ſet in the Church*, whatſoever that Church is, it proves it to be one Political body.

2. The caſe wholly differs, for Juſtices, Conſtables, *&c.* have limited Commiſſions, confined to their particular Precincts; whereas the Commiſſion of Miniſters is large and univerſal (as hath been proved.) If our Brethren would chuſe a fit reſemblance, let them take it from that of the Empire before mentioned, wherein the Princes are ſet in and over the whole Empire, and he that ſhall ſay, In the Empire are ſet Princes, States, *&c.* ſhall imply that ſuch Princes and States, beſides their ſpecial relation to their particular Territories, have another relation to the whole Empire.

3. It is not barely the phraſe we reſt upon, but the ſenſe and the explication of the phraſe given us by other Scriptures, and which neceſſity requires in this place, as plainly appears from the Apoſtles, who were ſo ſet in the Church, that they were alſo ſet over the Church; ſo are not Juſtices, they are in, not over the Commonwealth; and who, beſides a ſpecial relation to their particular parts

(which

(which we have before diſcourſed of,) have alſo a relation to, and over the whole Church: And ſo have other Miniſters to, *ſuo modo*, as hath been proved; and both Apoſtles and Miniſters are equalized in this, that they are in and over the whole Church, and ſo have a relation to it.

4. They ſay, *The Church, in* 1 *Cor.* 12. *may be taken for this or that Church; and ſo the body to be edified, for this or that particular body*, Eph. 4.

Reply. That cannot be, for it is one Church in which all the Apoſtles and Miniſters are ſet, 1 *Cor.* 12. It is one body which all the Apoſtles and Paſtors, *&c.* were given to edifie and perfect. It is that body into which we all are baptized, both Jews and Gentiles, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. It is that one body which is Chriſt, *i. e.* myſtical, which is made up of all the members of Chriſt, *v.* 12. It is that one body which is called the whole body, *Eph.* 4. 16. *From whom the whole body fitly joyned together*, &c. And ſurely he had need have a good confidence of his abilities, that will aſſert, that all this is true of a particular Church.

Another Argument uſed by the Provincial Aſſembly was this, *That hence it follows that if a people unjuſtly through covetouſneſſe, ſtarve a Miniſter from them, or through hereſie or ſchiſm vote him down, in that caſe it is in their power to nullifie the Office of a Miniſter.*

To this our Brethren anſwer *inter alia*, That

1. *Though the people ſin, yet indeed they do nullifie the Office of a Miniſter, as if they ſhould murther a Miniſter, they nullifie his Office, and if they may debar him from the exerciſe of his Office, why may they not make void his Office?*

Reply 1. Our Brethren confound two things vaſtly differing, to wit, the nullifying of the Office, and the hindring of the exerciſe of the Office; It is true, the peoples oppoſition, nay indeed one mans violence may hinder the exerciſe, but cannot nullifie the Office.

2. It

2. I demand whether this hold of the Apoſtles or no: The Apoſtles were made Officers to the Church only, (ſay our Brethren) and they ſay they were conſtituted Officers by the Church, alledging *Acts* 1. (although the Scripture tell us the Apoſtles were *neither of man, nor by man*:) Well then, this being premiſed, Suppoſe when the Catholick Church was confined to one Congregation, this Congregation had proved hereticall, and voted down the Apoſtles: I only ſuppoſe it, and ſuppoſitions are allowed by all, and to deny that liberty is a tergiverſation: Nor doth this ſuppoſition imply any contradiction to that promiſe that God hath made, that he will preſerve his Church, for that might have been preſerved in the Apoſtles alone. I now *Quere*, Whether in this caſe the Apoſtolical Office had been null or no?

If they affirm it, as it is a ſtrange aſſertion, ſo it is alſo falſe: For 1. The Apoſtles were not conſtituted by man, and therefore their Office could not be nullified by man. 2. The Apoſtles in ſuch a caſe had a power officially and authoritatively to denounce the wrath of God againſt them, *Mat.*10.14. *And whoſoever ſhall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart—ſhake off the duſt of your feet.* 3. They were Apoſtles even to Heathens to be converted, as we have proved.

If they deny it, I prove it thus, that it muſt needs follow from their principles: For

1. The Church being, according to them, the adequate *correlatum* of the Apoſtles, the Church ceaſing, they muſt needs ceaſe alſo.

2. *Ejuſdem eſt inſtituere & deſtituere*, and ſeeing they allow the inſtitution and conſtitution of the Apoſtles to the people.

3. I thus diſprove that monſtrous paradox: That which renders it in the power of mens luſts or humours to

to nullifie the promiſes of Chriſt, the authority, end and uſe of Chriſts Ambaſſadors, is moſt abſurd. That which makes it in the power of men, whether there ſhall be any Officially to preach peace, to remit ſins, *&c.* is highly dangerous; But ſuch is this doctrine. I prove the *minor* by theſe ſteps; 1. There are now none but ordinary Miniſters in the Church. 2. The eſſence of a Miniſter (ſay our Brethren) conſiſts in relation to a particular Church, which is his *correlatum*, and *ſublato uno relatorum tollitur alterum*, ſo that when that relation ceaſeth, his Miniſtry ceaſeth. 3. It is in the power of the people to diſſolve that relation, to eject a Miniſter; ſo ſay our Brethren, and it is generally aſſerted by Congregational men. 4. That which one Congregation may do, another may do, and ſo every one may do: Suppoſe then that there are twenty, and but twenty Congregations in the world, if each of theſe reſolve ſeverally to eject their Miniſters, through covetouſneſſe, hereſie, *&c.* I ſay, then it is in the power of theſe men to falſifie Chriſts word, and deſtroy the authority, end and uſe of Chriſts Ambaſſadors. But you will ſay, it is in the power of men to kill theſe Miniſters, one as well as another, and ſo thereby, as well as by our way, it is in the power of men to diſannull the promiſe of Chriſt. And therefore as it would be anſwered in that caſe, that the bones of Chriſt were breakable, yet by divine providence were kept from being broken; ſo though it is *remotè* in the power of men to kill all thoſe Miniſters, yet God will reſtrain them from the act of killing them, that he may keep his promiſe; in like manner though it is in the power of ſuch Churches to depoſe them, yet God will hinder the act, *&c.*

I Anſwer the caſe is wholly different, the one is an act of horrid violence, the other a juridical act, and here is the great inconvenience for a man to aſſert, that Jeſus Chriſt

hath given to every Congregation a juridical power to depose their Ministers when ever they please, for the power of judging is left by our Brethren in their hands; and to disanul an Ordinance of Christ, and to punish an Officer and Ambassador of Christ without his fault, and without all hope of remedy. In what a sad condition were Gospel Ministers, if it were in the power of their people upon every *Capricio*, when ever the humour takes them, to rob a godly Minister, it may be for the faithful discharge of his duty among them, of that which he accounts better than a world, and that without any possibility of redresse, forasmuch as he hath none to make his appeal to. How secure might a people be in their wickedness, if when a Minister reproves them sharply for their sins, they might take away from their Minister the power of reclaiming their sins, or officially denouncing wrath against them.

But they have a second Answer to relieve them. *If such a rejection of their Officers do not nullifie his Office, the reason is, because he is* de jure, *and of right still over that Church as their Officer, though hindred from the exercise of his Office.*

And this indeed is much more tolerable than the other, but our Brethren have lost the benefit of this refuge, forasmuch as they positively acknowledge, that the people have a power to annull his Office: And besides it helps them not at all, for if the people, and they only, they beyond appeal, have a full juridical power of deposing and rejecting their Ministers (as our Brethren hold) then they only have a power to judge whether the cause of the deposition be just or unjust, and be it just, or unjust, the Minister hath no way but to acquiesce in their sentence; for if once this gap were opened, either in Church or State, that a person judged and censured might thwart the judgment of the supream Court, by his private

private opinion, it would introduce intolerable confusion: It is true in such a case he may appeal to God, and find comfort in this, that *in foro Dei* his cause is good, but as for the *forum humanum* he is gone irrecoverably: And however neighbouring Churches, or Ministers may endeavour to convince and rectifie such a Church, and to perswade them to own him as their Minister, yet, if they will persist, they must all be contented, and he must not be owned for a Minister. And thus much may serve for the Vindication of those Arguments which were urged by the Assembly.

I shall now take notice of two or three of their Arguments.

Their chief Argument is this: *A Minister is a Pastour only to his own Flock: But it is only a particular Church which is his Flock*, Ergo *He is a Pastour only to his particular Church: The* minor *is proved thus, All that is a mans Flock, he is commanded actually to feed, and to take heed to, and he sins if he do not*, Acts 20.28. *But no Bishop is commanded actually to feed the whole Church*, Ergo *the whole Church is not his Flock*, p. 8.

Ans. 1. The *major* of the first Syllogisme is untrue: A Minister is a Pastour to his own Flock *especially*, but not *only*.

2. The *major* of the second Syllogism is denied. A Minister is not obliged actually to feed all his Flock; and I suppose I shall give an unanswerable reason for the denial of it. Every Apostle was a Catholick Pastour, and so had the whole Church for his Flock, *Mat.* 28.19, 20. Here our Brethren are consenters. But every Apostle was not obliged actually to feed the whole Church, and all Nations, they neither did it, nor was it possible for them to do it, and therefore their work was divided among them; the Circumcision being more especially committed to *Peter*,

ter, and the uncircumciſion to *Paul*: And yet, although by this diſtribution, *Paul* had a ſpecial relation to the Gentiles, and was obliged to feed them more eſpecially, yet he had upon him the care of all the Churches, and it was his duty, as far as his abillty and occaſions reached, to feed the whole Church, and no farther: And ſo it is with ordinary Miniſters, though they are eſpecially obliged to feed their own Flocks, and indeed can do no more conſtantly, yet according to their ability and opportunity they are bound to feed the whole Church, by teaching, and conſulting, *&c.* And this is the only Argument urged formally in this place againſt our Aſſertion. But becauſe there are ſome other paſſages which ſeem to be argumentative, though ſcattered elſewhere, I thought fit to do them that right, as to bring them in here, that ſo the Reader might ſee all their ſtrength together.

Their ſecond Argument is this; *This makes the power of ordinary Miniſters as extenſive and large as that of the Apoſtles.*

Anſ. I Anſwer plainly and clearly, that the difference between Apoſtolical and Paſtoral power lies not in the extent of their relation (If any aſſert it, let them prove it) but in the independency, ſuperiority, and ſingularity of juriſdiction, which, if it be not ſufficient to diſtinguiſh between Apoſtles, and ordinary Miniſters, beſides their excellent and infallible gifts, I dare make our Brethren Judges.

Their third Argument is this; *Miniſters are only Paſtours to them whom they can govern, as well as teach: but Miniſters cannot exerciſe Church-Government towards Heathens, for they are not their Flock, and therefore in preaching to Heathens they act not as Officers, but as gifted brethren*, p. 18.

The Anſwer to this is not difficult; If the not exerciſing of Government be a ſufficient foundation for this aſ-

ſertion,

ſertion, that a Miniſter preacheth not to ſuch as a Paſtour, then the Apoſtles did not preach as Officers to Heathens; for towards ſuch they could not exerciſe Church-Government: *What have I to do to judge them that are without*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. But the Apoſtles did preach as Officers to Heathens, which hath been already fully proved.

Their fourth Argument is; *That this brings in Epiſcopacy, to make one man an Officer over many Churches.* And this Argument I have often wondred to meet in all ſorts of *anti*-Presbyterians, Greeks, and Barbarians, wiſe and unwiſe, learned and unlearned, all agree in this charge; and they proſecute it with ſo much confidence, and eagerneſſe, that if a man had ſo much charity, or ſo little judgment as to beleeve them, he would think there were no difference between *Geneva* and *Canterbury*.

For Anſwer, to omit other differences which might be inſiſted on, as 1. That the Epiſcopal way leaves to inferiour Miniſters nothing but the Name and Title of Officers, all power of juriſdiction being ingroſſed into the Biſhops hands; whereby all other Miniſters are made a ſtrange kind of men, being Officers without Office, Rulers without rule, *&c.* Whereas in the Presbyterian way, every particular Officer is confeſſedly inveſted with, and hath liberty for the exerciſe of his Office, and power as need requires.

2. That Government by Biſhops, is a Government by forreigners, as it were, the power of Ruling being neither in the hands of the people, nor of any choſen by them, (as it is in the Presbyterian way) but in the hands of perſons wholly extraneous to moſt of the Churches they rule, and generally, neither knowing of, nor known to thoſe whom they undertake to govern. But I wave theſe things and many other, as being extravagant in this place: This only I obſerve for the preſent purpoſe.

The formality of Epiſcopacy lies in this, in the ſuperi-

ority of one Pastour to another, and to many other; and of one Church to all the rest in a Dioceſſe; not in the ſuperiority of a Colledge of Pastors, or convention of Churches over one Pastour or Church: Will any indite the Apoſtles for introducing Epiſcopacy, becauſe all the Apoſtles met together, *Acts* 15. did aſſume a ſuperiority over *Paul*, (who was there met, as the reſt, in the capacity of an Elder) and examine and judge of his Doctrine? Shall any man ſay the united Provinces in the low-Countries are under a Monarchy, becauſe every particular Governour, *&c.* is ſubject and accountable to the reſt of the Governours, the States Generall? this no man will ſay but he that underſtands not the difference between Government by one, and by many: And therefore it is equally abſurd to charge us with Epiſcopacy, becauſe we would have every particular Officer and Church ſubject (not to any one man, that, and that alone is Epiſcopacy) but to a convention of Officers, *&c.* And therefore for the future I ſhall deſire our Brethren to forbear ſuch frivolous and intemperate accuſations. And this is all that I ſhall ſay to this preſent Queſtion, cloſing only with this intimation, that I principally recommend the ſerious and impartial conſideration of what is here ſaid, unto ſuch, who though they profeſſe they will be ordained (and we are obliged to believe their profeſſions) yet for the preſent refuſe it, becauſe they are not called to any particular charge; I hope what hath been ſaid will ſatisfie ſome at leaſt, that although it is convenient that every Miniſter ſhould have relation to ſome one Church, yet he hath alſo a relation to the whole, and his relation to a particular Church as a Lecturer is foundation fully ſufficient for his Ordination.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

THe principall Question is this:

Whether Gifted persons may preach ordinarily without Ordination.

State of the Question.

I shall not need to take much pains about the stating of the Question, that being fully done in the Assemblies Book. These things only I shall say,

1. We speak of persons truly gifted, not every one that conceits himself to be gifted; not of them, who, however in their own conceits they are gifted, yet indeed have need to be instructed in the Principles of Religion: And that is the true case of many of our gifted preachers in *England:* For such our Brethren say they do not plead, and yet I cannot tell what to make of this, if it look not that way, when they say, *Though one that is really gifted, for ought we know may lawfully preach without approbation, from the Church or others, yet it may be inexpedient:* so that hereby it is left to every man (as to the lawfulnesse of it) to judge of his gifts, and to preach, if he think himself fit. This also must be said, that the assertion of this Doctrine was that which opened the gap unto all that crew, and which hath been the unhappy occasion of involving this poor Church and Nation in those crouds of errors and confusion which are now too rife amongst us.

2. We dispute not what may be done in cases of necessity, either in preaching to Heathens, *&c.* or in preaching in order to trial, (which is necessary to take an account of a mans sufficiency for the Work.)

3. We do not in this place restrain Ordination to our way;

way of Ordination: Whether it belongs to the Presbytery or to the people to ordain, we are not concerned in this Queſtion, which is barely this: *Whether a ſolemn miſſion or ſetting apart be neceſſary for a mans ordinary preaching?* Our Brethren deny. We affirm.

But for the full underſtanding of the Queſtion, I refer the Reader to our *Jus Divinum*; wherein, becauſe our Brethren acquarrell ſome things, I ſhall take notice of what deſerves Animadverſion.

The main thing is this, They find fault with the definition given of Preaching, and they ſay, *Any publiſhing, opening or applying Goſpel-truths to any perſons for the uſes and ends they ſerve to, yea though it be but to a ſingle perſon,* is Preaching. By this rule we are all Preachers, bond and free, male and female, wiſe and unwiſe, ſeeing this is frequently done by perſons of all ſorts, and in this ſenſe, both men and women are ſaid προφήτευειν, ſuch preaching we diſpute not againſt, but enjoyn it to people of all ſorts. In that ſenſe we do, as *Moſes*, wiſh that *all the Lords people were Prophets*: This is that which upon all occaſions we preſs private Chriſtians to; that they would inſtruct the ignorant, admoniſh the unruly, *&c.* privately. And truly this buſineſſe conſcienciouſly managed, would ſo take up the gifts and time of moſt Chriſtians, that they would never be charged at the laſt day for wrapping their Talents in a napkin, though they never aſſumed the publick work of the Miniſtry.

It is then publick Preaching that we diſpute againſt, we will not quarrell about words: If that ſhall be Preaching which our Brethren will call ſo, be it ſo; then in that ſenſe we diſpute not againſt Preaching, but Preaching publikely.

There is another thing which they cannot digeſt, to wit, the diſtinction which we made between Preaching, and the

the ſpeaking of a General to his Army, &c. wherein the *object is a Congregation, not ſacred, but meerly civil,* &c. To this they ſay, *It is preaching, though the object of it be a Congregation not ſacred, but prophane and Idolatrous, for Infidels are to be preached to: And if the General of an Army open and apply Scriptures, not for a civil end chiefly, but for the inſtruction and edification of thoſe he ſpeaks to, and this, not in an intermixed way to qualifie civil actions, how this can be denied to be preaching, we know not.*

To which I Reply, 1. In that caſe we muſt diſtinguiſh between *finis operis*, and *finis operantis*; the end of the work in its own nature, and the end of the worker. Suppoſe a Philoſophy Profeſſor is reading a Philoſophicall Lecture of the exiſtence of God, or the immortality of the ſoul, (wherein he takes occaſion to open and apply divers Scriptures) poſſibly he being a good man, may aim at the ſpiritual and eternal good of his hearers, yet none will call this preaching, becauſe though the end of the Reader was, their ſalvation, yet the end of the Reading was quite of another nature. So if a religious General in ſpeaking to his Army, when going to fight, principally aims at the ſalvation of their ſouls, yet this is not preaching; for though his end in ſpeaking be their ſalvation, yet indeed the end of the work in it ſelf (and that is it by which all actions muſt be eſtimated, for the end of the actors may be various and infinite) I ſay, the end of the work is to encourage them to the battel.

2. A company of Heathens met together in the caſe ſuppoſed, though they are not a ſacred Congregation, yet the end of their meeting (ſuppoſe to hear *Paul* preach to them) is ſacred, I mean, the end of the work, though not the end of the workers; and however it is with the hearers, yet the end of the actor or ſpeaker is purely and ſolely the ſalvation of their ſouls; and ſo it is truly,

and may properly be called Preaching.

3. But in this case, I say, a General may not publickly open and apply Scriptures to his Army, unless in a case of necessity, or in order to a civil end, *i.e.* their encouragement to battel.

There is one thing more in the stating of the Question, which they trouble themselves much about, concerning our sense in the use of that phrase of authoritative preaching, and how they tell us, that *Authority is sometimes taken for a right or power to do some publick work; sometimes for the majesty, fervor and gravity which is to attend the dispensation of the Gospel; sometimes for that power which an Officer hath over his people; and* (say they) *we judge that our Brethren take authoritative preaching in this sense, because they oppose it to brotherly charitative preaching.* But this is to seek a knot in a bulrush, for our meaning was sufficiently plain, and we did not speak of an authoritative preaching, as if we did allow any publick preaching which is not authoritative, but only put it as a character of, and convertible with publick preaching (unless in cases of necessity) and so the Assembly expressed themselves clearly and fully; *We distinguish*, say they, *between a private, brotherly teaching*, &c. *and an authoritative publick-teaching.*

And this is all I shall say for the stating of the Question, which now I come to discusse, and I shall do it τὸν τρόπον, in this method:

1. I shall propound and Answer their Arguments.

2. I shall propound and Vindicate our Arguments. And this method (though somewhat preposterous) I chuse, because I would follow the order of their book as farre as I can with any conveniency.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

THeir first Argument is this:

Election must go before Ordination: But a person must preach, yea preach frequently and ordinarily, before Election, for without this the people cannot discern his gifts, &c. Ergo *Persons not Ordained may ordinarily preach.*

Ans. 1. They know their *major* is not beyond exception, but I let that passe, because afterwards we shall handle it more fully.

2. For their *minor*, if it be true, then preaching frequently and ordinarily in that case is necessary, *i. e.* for the trial of their gifts, and that we dispute not about, but whether out of a case of neceffity one may preach ordinarily without Ordination.

But this first Argument I suppose they intended only for Velitation: Their second Argument is the *Achilles*, which I must now come to grapple with. There are two pillars of their cause, Scripture precept, and Scripture example alledged; and indeed either of these shall serve turn: But we must not take them upon their bare word, but weigh what they have said in the ballance of the Sanctuary. It is Scripture precept which is here discussed.

Their second Argument then is this:

Such as are commanded to preach may preach: But some men not Ordained are commanded to preach; Ergo. The *minor* they prove thus; *All that are apt to teach, are commanded to teach*: This they attempt to prove from 1 *Pet.* 4.10,11. but by their favour let us adde *v.* 9. to it, for our Brethren represent the place *imagine lusci*, with an half face. The whole [illegible] is this, *v.* 9. *Use hospitality one to another without grudging.* V. 10. *As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as*

good ſtewards of the manifold grace of God. V. 11. *If any man ſpeak, let him ſpeak as the oracles of God; if any miniſter, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth.* Where any indifferent Reader will obſerve the words mainly inſiſted upon, to be like a little *Iſthmus* of land between two ſeas, to either of which it may be related: Or like a tree ſtanding in the confines of two Counties, it being hard to determine to which County it belongs. It may look backward and relate to hoſpitality; It may look forward and relate to ſpeaking and miniſtring; and the words will bear either ſenſe, but both ſenſes it cannot bear, that being an undoubted truth, that *Senſus unius loci literalis non eſt niſi unicus*; and to demonſtrate that it muſt relate to this, and cannot relate to the other, will be found very difficult, if not impoſſible: And yet upon this doubtfull place our Brethren hang the weight of their Cauſe.

I find a threefold ſenſe given of theſe words: Some referre it to the gift of ſpeaking by any, *&c.* Others, to the Office of ſpeakers. Others, to the giving of Alms: Of theſe I ſhall ſpeak in order, premiſing onely one thing, (which is well ſuggeſted by Dr *Collings*) *i. e.* that whatever the ſenſe of the place is if it be a command to preach, yet this Epiſtle being written to ſtrangers, and in a ſcattered eſtate of the Church; that might be lawfull to them in that caſe of neceſſity, which otherwiſe is unlawfull: But I will not preſſe that too far.

Firſt then, Their ſenſe is this; That whatſoever gift a man hath he is required to exerciſe it; if he hath a gift to preach, and that publickly, he muſt preach, *&c.* And to prove this ſenſe, I obſerve they uſe three Arguments, which I ſhall propound and conſider.

1. *It is a gift indefinitely, and therefore it may extend to all gifts.* P. 32.

Anſ.

Anſ. 1. And ſuppoſe it do extend to all gifts, it is a truth granted by us, that whatſoever gift a man hath, he ought to exercise it, but ſtil, as he is called to it, and in his own ſphear.

2. Nothing more uſual then for an expreſſion indefinite in words, to be definite in ſenſe, and to be limited *pro ſubjectâ materiâ*, according to the matter in hand. It would be vanity to multiply inſtances in a caſe ſo known. If our Brethren were diſcourſing with an Arminian, about the extent of Chriſts death, who ſhould urge the word *world*, and *mankind*, and infer as they do, that the word being indefinite, it is to be taken of all mankind, they would quickly find an anſwer, that ſuch indefinite expreſſions are to be compared with, and explained by other places, where they are reſtrained; and the ſame Anſwer may ſtop the mouth of this Argument: So that to argue from the indefiniteneſſe of the phraſe is but looſe reaſoning.

2. They ſay, *This general expreſſion muſt be interpreted and limited by that which follows*, If any man ſpeak, *&c. pag.* 33.

Anſ. 1. It may every whit as well be limited and interpreted by the foregoing words, and if ſo, then all that our Brethren ſay from theſe words fals to the ground.

2. If it muſt be limited by the following words, ſo it may, without any prejudice to our cauſe, in this manner, *v.*10. he laies this down in the general, that every man that hath a gift muſt uſe it; then in the 11th *verſe*, he inſtanceth in two ſorts of men that have received gifts, to wit, Miniſters and Deacons, who muſt be carefull to uſe their gifts, and therefore in like manner all others are obliged to uſe the gifts that God hath given them: Or if they will not allow theſe to be Officers, it may be limited according to their own apprehenſions, that as every man

in general is to use his gifts, so in particular every man that hath preaching gifts is to use them; but how? *i.e.* as far as God doth call him forth to the use of them, but no further; and to us there appears no ordinary way now of Gods calling forth men to this work, but by Ordination.

3. They argue from the particle As; *As he hath received*, i.e. *according to the nature of his gift, he that hath private gifts, must use them privately; he that hath publick gifts*, i.e. *gifts fit for publick use, must use them publickly*, p. 33.

Ans. 1. The word καθὼς may well be understood causally, because he hath received it.

2. And if it be meant thus (which we say is a truth) that God expects an use of talents, proportionable to what he gives, yet every one must act in his order, and in his place and sphear, and as God cals him forth, as we shall see more fully by and by.

3. But what if this proportion be meant of Almes-giving? then all that they say fals to the ground.

Thus we have seen how our Brethren sense this place, and what are the reasons that prevail with them so to do, which whether they be of that consequence as to justifie them in the holding of an opinion so offensive to thousands of sincere Christians, and so introductory of all confusion, I leave to sober Readers to judge. And yet their own sense doth draw after it such grosse and manifest absurdities, that they dare not abide by it absolutely, but qualifie it with an exception sufficient to invalidate all their Argument.

They say, *By this text all gifted persons are commanded to preach, unlesse there can be shewn some Scripture-prohibition to forbid their preaching*. p. 35.

To which I reply two things; 1. Hereby the plea is removed

removed to another Court, and the Queſtion lies here, Whether elſewhere there be any prohibition? which muſt be judged afterwards, by comparing our Arguments and their Anſwers.

2. It lies not upon us to ſhew a prohibition to reſtrain them from preaching, but upon them to ſhew a warrant for preaching (ſeeing for inſtituted worſhip we muſt have a poſitive warrant) which this place we ſee affords not, and whether any other place affords, we ſhall ſee hereafter. But we muſt not yet part with our Brethrens Argument from this place. There are three or four difficulties with which it is gravel'd.

The firſt is that urged by Dr *Collins*, *Here is not only a liberty granted, but a duty enjoined, ſo that by this Text, gifted perſons not only may, but muſt preach, and that without election or calling, for the Churches neglect of their duty, muſt not make him neglect his.*

The full vindication of this, I ſhall leave to that reverend Author, but I cannot wholly let it go untouched: I ſhall form the Argument thus, They who are by vertue of a divine precept to preach the Goſpel, are to do it neceſſarily, *Neceſſity is laid upon me, yea, wo is unto me if I preach not the Goſpel*, they are to do it in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon, they are to give themſelves wholly to theſe things, they are not to leave the Word of God to ſerve tables: But all that have preaching gifts are not under ſuch obligations, our Brethren being Judges. *Ergo*, they are not obliged to preach the Goſpel.

The *major* I prove, *Ubi lex non diſtinguit, non eſt diſtinguendum.* The Scripture takes no notice of two ſorts of preachers, whereof the one may preach ſeldomer or oftner as they pleaſe, and as the Church deſires; and the other muſt preach frequently, conſtantly; and even thoſe upon whom the leſt obligation lies in our Brethrens opinion, are

are commanded. It is true no preachers are in Scripture obliged to preach in ſuch or ſuch a place, nor to preach ſo often (the determination of theſe and other like circumſtances, is left to the rules of prudence, and general direction of the word) yet all are obliged to be inſtant and diligent in the work: And as the ſervice of the Church is unſpeakably to be preferred before the beſt merchandize, and Gods glory before their own worldly intereſt; ſo when a man hath received gifts for the ſervice of preaching, if theſe commands oblige him to preach, they oblige him to throw off all the impediments of that noble work, and to give himſelf wholly to theſe things: And the rather, becauſe of our Brethrens own Argument; A man muſt exerciſe his gift as he hath received it. Now if a man have ability to preach ordinarily and conſtantly every Lords day, if he would uſe ſufficient diligence, ſuch a man diſchargeth not his truſt in preaching ſparingly and occaſionally only.

Obj. But they ſay, that *the caſe of a Miniſter and a gifted brother are alike in this, A Miniſter ſins not, if he be put out of employment, and caſt into a place where his gifts are not deſired*, &c. *And ſo it is with gifted men*, &c.

Anſ. Will our Brethren then ſay, that others not deſiring a man to exerciſe his gifts, will juſtifie him in the not exerciſing of it? Can any man diſpence with anothers wrapping his Talent in a napkin? What if *Paul* had come to a place where he was not deſired to preach, (which often was his caſe) was he then free from his neceſſity of preaching? Or what if a Church grow weary of hearing and preaching, ſo that they deſire not their Paſtour to preach among them, Will this excuſe him, if he throw off preaching? For my part I muſt profeſſe, were I in that caſe, though I might think it more advantageous to the Church to diſpoſe of my ſelf in ſome other place. yet

ſhould

ſhould I by no means look at it as a diſpenſation from the work of preaching, though no man ſhould deſire me, (were there but any that would hear me.) Nay more, where the Apoſtles were not only, not deſired, but forbidden to preach, yet they accounted it their duty to continue in that work. Whether that hold in ordinary Miniſters, I ſhall not now diſpute; this only I ſhall ſay, (and that is fully ſufficient for our purpoſe) that if a Miniſter be put out of employment, or be in a place where he is not deſired to preach, yet if he may be permitted to preach, and the affairs of the Church require it, he ought to do it, or to employ himſelf in ſome other way, which may be equivalent for the Churches ſervice.

I ſhall adde but one Argument to our Brethren, taken from their own words; Whatſoever duty a man may lawfully do, that he is bound to do: *But one that is really gifted for preaching (for ought we know) may lawfully preach without approbation from a Church, or from others,* ſay they; Therefore, one that is really gifted is bound to preach, although neither the Church nor others do approve it, much leſſe deſire it. The *major* is moſt clear, and it were a contradiction to ſay, that ſuch a thing is a duty, which may in ſuch a caſe be lawfully done, and yet that it is not his duty, or that he is not bound to it: The *minor* is their own words. And this is the firſt inconvenience their ſenſe of this place runs upon.

A ſecond is this, That hereby it will follow that women may, nay muſt preach.

A third is, That by the ſame rule, every one who hath a gift to be a General, Magiſtrate, *&c.* may undertake thoſe places: To theſe our Brethren ſay ſomething by way of Anſwer; but the Reply I muſt leave to him who is more concerned in them: they are ſo fully and largely diſcuſſed by divers already, that it is needleſſe to ſay any thing more

of them, and we may have occasion to speak of them hereafter.

But the fourth and principall thing is this: *It is true, every one is to exercise his gift, but in his own sphear, publick persons publickly, private persons privately; and so did* Aquila *and* Priscilla, *Acts* 18. *and those women,* Phil. 4.3.

And because here the shoe pincheth, our Brethren make a strong attempt against this assertion, and endeavour to batter it down by divers Considerations.

For the examples of *Aquila* and *Priscilla,* they say, 1. *It appears not whether they were apt to preach publickly or no.* p.42.

*Ans.*1. It appears that they were excellently gifted, in such a measure that *Paul* cals them his *co-workers*, or fellow labourers (for so much the word συνεργοι imports) in the work of the Gospel, *Rom.*16.3. Nor is it in the least intimated that they were not gifted to speak in publick; and therefore seeing the excellency of their gifts is mentioned, without any note of restraint or diminution, it is most ingenuous and reasonable, to conclude they were apt to speak publickly.

2. *They instructed* Apollo *privatly, for that was most expedient.* p.42.

Ans. It is true it was most fit to do it privately, yet not so, as that it was inconvenient to advise *Apollo* to be a diligent hearer publickly: They might have taught *Apollo* (with others) publickly, without any reflection upon him: Seeing therefore we reade of their doing it privately, not a word of their doing it publickly, it is a certain truth which we assert, that they instructed privately, and but a meer supposition that they did, or might do it publickly.

2. As to the main Objection they say many things: To take notice of all they say will be needlesse: The strength

ſtrength of what they have, lies in theſe things:

1. *Private men may do the ſame work with preaching*, i.e. *they may open and apply Scriptures, exhort, rebuke*, &c. p.44.

And becauſe they know we grant this, and ſay they may do the ſame work, but not in the ſame manner, not publickly, they adde

2. *That every Church-member is obliged to teach and admoniſh every fellow member, as occaſion requires*, p 46.

Anſ. If they mean that every member is bound to do this publickly (elſe it is nothing to the purpoſe, for to do it privatly we allow) then not only gifted brethren, but all the brethren, yea and ſiſters to, not only may, but muſt turn publick preachers.

3. *A publick gift cannot be fully improved, if it be not uſed publickly, but privately only*, p.47.

Anſ. 1. If therefore any really have publick gifts, and deſire to uſe them publickly, let them with the houſhold of *Stephanas*, addict themſelves wholly to the work of the Miniſtry, and not interlope betwixt two Callings.

2. I would know of our Brethren, whether this general rule (upon which their Argument hangs) be true or falſe, to wit, That the bare having of a gift fit for publick uſe, is of it ſelf a ſufficient ground for that publick uſe of it, without any other call. If they ſay that it is not true in the general, but only true in this particular caſe, then they diſcover to all the world, that it is but an hypotheſis of their own, meerly taken up for the defence of a *præ*-conceived opinion: If they ſay it is true in the general, then, what if a woman is gifted to teach? or a man gifted to rule? The Argument is every whit as ſtrong. I will return their own Argument upon them thus. Every man ought fully to improve the gift he hath, and if he have a publick gift, he ought to improve it publickly: But many private men have the gift of Ruling,

Judging, Leading an Army, &c. and this gift cannot be fully improved, but by the publick exercise of it: Therefore such private men ought publickly to exercise such gifts. There is no way to avoid this conclusion, but by saying that besides these gifts a call is required, which till a man hath, he is not obliged to exercise his gifts publickly. And the same Answer (if our Brethren will be candid) may satisfie them, That besides preaching gifts, there is a call required (whatever that call be) and till a man hath that call he is not to exercise his preaching gifts publickly, nor do his gifts oblige him or warrant him thereunto.

4. They say, *Publickneſſe in acting is not so material a thing, it doth not make an act to be an act of Office, the publickneſs of the act doth not make it preaching; private men spake publickly*, Acts 15. 12. *Any private men may give Almes publickly in the Assembly, which is the Deacons Office.* p. 49.

Ans. 1. Though bare publickneſſe of speaking makes it not preaching, yet that is one main ingredient of that preaching which is now in Question, and (as we judge) a property of Authoritative preaching: And so material is the difference between publick and private teaching or preaching (call it what you will, for I hate *logomachies*) that although this latter is allowed to women, and was performed by *Priscilla*, yet publick teaching, or teaching in the Church-Assembly is forbidden to women upon this account, because it is an authoritative act, as is most evident from 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. & 1 *Tim.* 2. 11, 12. where the very reason given why they must not teach in publick, is because they must not usurp authority; concluding beyond contradiction, that to preach publickly is an act of authority, and inconsistent with a state of subjection, and therefore not to be performed by any who are in a state of

of subjection, and under obedience to Officers, whether men or women. Yea further, whereas some of our Brethren contend, that although preaching constantly in publick be unlawfull to gifted men, yet preaching occasionally may be lawfull. I offer it to their consideration, that it is not only preaching constantly, which is here forbidden to women, but also preaching occasionally, though but once in publick, seeing even such preaching is accounted an act of authority: And therefore by a parity of reason gifted men are forbidden to preach, not only constantly, but also occasionally (further then necessity requires, *&c*)

2. For *Acts* 15. we allow private men, though not to preach, yet to speak publickly in divers cases, as at Vestries, Synods, *&c.* sometimes propounding questions, desiring to be further satisfied, *&c.*

3. For the last clause it is a meer fallacy; for though in that case a private man give his alms publickly, yet indeed he doth not give the Publick Alms (which is the Deacons office) but only his own private alms he gives in a publick way.

5. They say, *It is usuall for a man being requested, to do the work of another mans calling; one that is no Schoolmaster may tend a School occasionally for a few daies, and yet he doth not go out of his sphear.* p. 50.

Ans. The parallel no way holds, for, though for other reasons the gift of some Schoolmasters places is limited, yet indeed in it self, neither the Office nor Work of a Schoolmaster is restrained, either by Divine or Humane Law; any man that is fit, may manage it, and we see ordinarily persons uncalled set up Schools without any authority, and yet without any blame. If they would have a fit parallel, take that of a Magistrate; What if a Justice of the peace request another man to sit for him upon the bench? may he do it? I trow not.

6 They say, *A man may chuse it as his calling to preach, and fit himself for it, &c. (though he do not own Ordination as that which gives him a call) now in this case, he doth not go out of his calling to preach. Men who have other callings, may leave them and become teachers,* Heb. 5. 12. *Nor doth the* 1 Cor. 7. 20. *forbid a change of callings, but only command a man in his calling to abide with God,* v. 24. p. 51.

Ans. I. Designation of a mans self to a calling, is one thing, and a solemn inauguration into that calling is another thing: Suppose a man design himself for the service of a state, *&c.* untill he be by authority installed into some Office of State, he is but a private person (notwithstanding all his intentions and preparations for that work) and if he should undertake to do the acts of an Officer of State, before he receive a civil Ordination (as I may call it) he should go out of his sphear. In like manner, whosoever designes himself for the Ministry, and intends that calling, yet, if he undertake to do the acts of the Office before he be called to it, he goes out of his place.

II. For *Heb.* 5. 12. I must needs declare that I am sorry to see good men take such liberty to wrest the Scripture to serve their conceits: O how great is the power of prejudice! But I Answer,

1. Do our Brethren indeed believe that it was the duty (duty I say, for *Paul* speaks not what they may do, but what they ought to do) of all the Hebrews, men and women (for to both he writes promiscuously) to be publick teachers?

2. Say that all must endeavour to be teachers, what then? must they needs be publick teachers? *A genere ad speciem non valet illatio affirmativa.* They ought to be able to teach their families, to teach Heathens, to teach babes in Christ, and this will run smoothly and take in all. It is the duty of all men and women to grow in knowledge,

ledge, and to be able to teach others, according as their place and opportunity inables them.

Obj. *But he speaks of such teaching as babes in Christ do not attain to, and such as is attained by long time, and such as belongs to grown Christians*, v.12,13,14. *whereas all believers and babes in Christ are teachers in that private brotherly way, and therefore this cannot be meant of private, but of publick teaching*, p.52.

Anſ. It follows not: The teaching here ſpoken of, though private, yet was not attained unto by the Hebrews, by babes in Chriſt, they were (according to the Apoſtl's deſcription) unable to teach their families, or to inſtruct an Heathen privately, if he had deſired information from them, for he tels us, *they had need that one ſhould teach them again, which be the firſt principles of the oracles of God.* Our Brethren perplex themſelves by confounding two things much differing, to wit, the duty and the ability: For babes in Chriſt it is their duty to teach, *i. e.* privately, yet they may want ability to teach.

3. Teachers are here taken for ſuch as are apt to teach, διδακτικους for διδασκαλους, not that the Apoſtle injoyns it upon all the Hebrews, as their duty actually to turn publick teachers (*If the whole body were the eye, where were the hearing?*) but only to be fit to teach, *ideſt*, in the ſenſe explained: As *Gal.*2.11. he was κατεγνωσμενος, *ideſt*, word for word, *condemned, blamed*, that is, he was to be blamed. So *Tully*, *Quis te damnatior?* that is, who is more to be blamed than thou.

III. For 1 *Cor.*7.20. Although I conceive not that every man is ſo obliged to continue in his calling, that he may not upon weighty reaſons change it for another; yet ſurely that text forbids a raſh and groundleſſe removing from one calling to another: As it is true, whether a man keeps his old calling or enters upon a new one, he ought

to

to do it with God (which is all that can be collected from the 24th *verse*) yet *v.* 20. servants, and so others *a pari*, are plainly commanded not to change their callings, *i. e.* rashly and causelessly.

7. They cite a command, *Heb.* 10.25. *But exhorting one another*, i. e. *in those Church-Assemblies, to which the opposition clearly referres it: Not only Officers, but all Christians are to do it*, p. 54. And whereas they know it will and may justly be replied, that by this rule all Christians are commanded to exhort publickly, they endeavour to take that off by saying, *only those that were able to do it are intended, as if a father bid all his children go to work, he doth not include the child in the cradle:* But here is a manifest halt; for all the grown Christians were able to teach, though not all alike, (as of the grown children some could work better, some worse, yet by their supposition all that can work *quovis modo*, are commanded to work.) Some had better, some had meaner gifts, but the very meanest could provoke to good works, and might say something to admonish, to counsel and comfort others, to perswade them to persevere, *&c.* nay to that purpose a sincere hearted man, though of very mean abilities, might speak more effectually then some able Teachers: So that if this place prove any thing to our Brethrens purpose, it will prove that it was the duty of every one, gifted or not gifted, to preach in the publick Assembly, which is not only false, but contrary to their own opinion.

But I Answer further; Their assembling together is not the modification of the exhortation (as if they were to do it in the publick Assembly) but the matter of the exhortation, they were (every one according to his place privately or publickly) to exhort one another, to what? even to this, that they would not *forsake the assembling of themselves together*, *i. e.* that they would not apostatize from

from the Christian Religion, and Christian Worship, and Christian Assemblies, nor relapse to Judaism, but that they would persevere to the end, that they would hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering, *v.* 23. And this concerns the first sense put upon the place, as if it obliged all gifted men to preach.

In the second place the Assembly take notice, that *by gift, may be understood the Office, he that speaketh,* i. e. *the publick Office-preacher, let him do it,* &c. *and he that ministreth,* i. e. *the Deacon:* And thus also others unconcerned in this quarrell, understand the words. But against this our Brethren offer divers exceptions.

1. They say, *Neither the context nor subsequent verses referre to Officers, but to Christians in general, therefore this doth not,* p. 57.

Ans. Nothing is more common in Scripture, than for general and special exhortations to be joyned together, and for the Apostles to make a transition from a general to a special exhortation, and from a special to a general, as almost every interpreter of Scripture observeth.

2. They say, *χάρις & χάρισμα are far more usually taken for gifts, than for an Office,* p. 59.

Ans. 1. It sufficeth that sometimes it is taken for an Office, and therefore so it may be taken here.

2. And if it be granted that gift is taken in their sense in this place, it availeth them not, for the 10 *verse* may be a general rule, wherein every man is commanded to exercise whatsoever gifts he hath received, and to exercise them in a right manner, and in the 11 *verse* he comes to instance in two particulars, the Publick teacher, saith he, as he hath received gifts for teaching, and the gift of the Office, so let him speak, *&c.* and so the Deacon, *&c.* And this shall suffice to speak of the second sense.

A word now of the third, which is this, That this

gift is meant of estates, &c. which a man is to use for Gods glory and the good of others, for so the dependance upon the foregoing words carries it; *Use hospitality*, &c. and then he addes a reason, because they have received it, and so may and ought to lay it out; or (if you will) as a rule to guide persons in the management of it, that they should lay out according to what they receive in. To this there are but two things objected:

1. *They are here called stewards, not of this worlds goods, but of the grace of God, and not of one grace only, to wit, charity, but of the manifold grace of God*, p. 35.

Anſ. The grace of God which properly signifies an attribute of God, is commonly in Scripture taken for the gracious effects and actings of that grace towards men. And whereas these effects and actings of grace are of two sorts, some concerning this life, and some concerning the other life, either of these, or any effects of grace may be called the grace of God Metonymically, and in respect of such temporal effects (as well as spiritual.) God is frequently said to be gracious, *Exod.* 22.— *It is his raiment —— and when he crieth unto me, then I will hear, for I am gracious:* So also *Amos* 5.15. 1 *Sam.* 12.22. 2 *Kings* 13.23.

And indeed, although this may possibly seem strange to him that is præpossessed with the common use and acception of the word *Grace* in the English tongue; yet can it not seem improbable to him who knows the use of the Greek word χάρις (and that is the language which the holy Ghost used) which is indeed nothing else but a favour or blessing, so that, all that we are here exhorted unto, is to be good stewards of the manifold favour of God, or of the manifold blessings which come from the grace and favour of God. And thus far our Brethren agree with us, that by the grace of God we are to understand the effects thereof.

thereof towards us; only here lies the difference between us, that they will needs expound it of the ſpiritual and internal acts of this grace (becauſe that ſeems to favour their cauſe moſt) when, as we ſay, it may be underſtood of the external and temporal effects of that grace, for of ſuch things he ſpake in the foregoing verſe: And in that ſenſe the word grace is taken in relation to men, *viz.* for the temporal effects of their grace or favour towards others, 2 *Cor.*8.19. *Who was choſen to travel with us, with this grace which is adminiſtred unto us, i. e.* with this charitable contribution, as all Interpreters agree. So that no man can juſtly ſtumble at that ſenſe of the word here. And for the addition of the word, *the manifold grace of God*, who knows not that Gods temporal favours (of all which we are to be good ſtewards) are manifold? There is as great multiplicity and variety in temporall as in ſpirituall bleſſings.

2. They ſay, *This will deſtroy the connexion of this verſe with the reſt.*

Anſ. 1. What more common then for exhortations of divers ſorts, in *Pauls* Epiſtles, to be joyned together without any coherence.

2. This doth not diſſolve the connexion, but only varies the connexion, for whereas they annex it to the following verſe, this ſenſe joynes it to the foregoing verſe.

And this may fully ſerve for the Vindication of this place of Scripture; wherein, though I have not taken notice of every word ſaid by our Brethren, yet any ingenuous Reader that compares theirs and mine together, will diſcern that I have not omitted any thing which is either conſiderable or plauſible, and for other things I have not ſo much ſpare time as to throw it away upon them.

And thus much for their ſecond Argument.

CHAP. VI.

THe third Argument will not call for much labour. They argue from a *Gospel promise*, Mat. 25. 29. *Unto every one that hath shall be given: Whatsoever gifts a man hath, if he improve them, God will increase his gifts.*

Ans. It is true, every one is to exercise his gifts, but every one *suo modo*, and *debito ordine*, as hath been frequently said, according to his capacity and place, and after a right order. What if a man be prudent and very fit to manage the Deacons work, and to distribute the Church-alms? must he undertake it (upon pretence of exercising his gifts) before he be called to it? No surely; 1 *Tim.* 3. 10. *Let them first be proved, then let them use the Office of a Deacon.* Or if a man hath gifts to rule a State, must he take upon him that work, before he be called to it? Surely no: And therefore a Preacher also, however gifted, yet must not publickly exercise his gifts till he have a call, some call I say or other, for I meddle not now with particulars, what that call is; only I say, besides gifts a call is required, without which he sins not, in the not exercising of his gifts in such a way (although exercise them he may divers waies.) And if our Brethren allow this in the Office of the Ruling Elder and Deacon, that how well soever they are gifted for those works, yet without a call, a call (I say) distinct from that which may be pretended by vertue of their gifts, they may not exercise those gifts, why should they not allow it in the Preaching Ministry? Why should not only the Offices, but also the works of these inferiour Offices be inclosed, and that higher and much more difficult work of the Ministry lie in common? And this shall suffice for their second Argument, wherein though

though divers things are ſaid, yet nothing of ſtrength is added, which hath not been conſidered and enervated under the foregoing Argument.

Their third Argument is taken from Goſpel preſidents or examples: They inſtance in two, 1. In *Apollo.* 2. In the ſcattered Saints, *Acts* 18.24.

1. In *Apollo*, and the marrow and ſtrength of what they ſay of him is this; *He preached publickly*, &c. *and yet was not ordained, for he knew only the Baptiſm of* John *(not the Baptiſm of Chriſt) to which the inſtitution of Ordination was ſubſequent; he had but an imperfect knowledge of the doctrine of Chriſt.*

Unto this inſtance divers things are ſaid, which our Brethren take notice of, and attempt to confute.

1. Whereas ſome Anſwer, *That* Apollo *was an extraordinary Officer, that he is ranked with* Paul *and* Peter, 1 *Cor.* 1.12. *that he is called a Miniſter,* 1 Cor.3.5.

To this they Anſwer, 1. *Let him prove it that will aſſert it: All that the text ſaith of him is, that he was eloquent and fervent*, &c. *which a man may be without thoſe extraordinary gifts*, p. 71.

Reply If this place doth not, yet others do imply that he was an extraordinary Officer, 1 *Cor.* 1.12.

Exc. *But that was afterward, when he went to Corinth; He might be a gifted man firſt, and yet afterwards an Officer* &c. *p.* 73.

Anſ. That *Apollo* had extraordinary gifts is very probable from that 1 *Cor.*1.12. being ranked with perſons ſo qualified, but when he received them, the Scripture is ſilent: The Scripture intimates that he had them at *Corinth*, but that he received them not before, *ne* τὸ *quidem.* The diſtance of time is not ſo great between his being at *Epheſus*, that is *Acts* 18.24. and in *Achaia*, that is *v.*27. of the ſame Chapter: And therefore it is moſt probable

he had thoſe extraordinary gifts when he was at *Epheſus*.

If it be objected againſt this, *that he was ignorant in many truths, inſtructed by* Aquila *and* Priſcilla, *p.* 71. The Anſwer may be this, that this is not inconſiſtent with his being a Prophet: God revealed not all his mind at once to all his Prophets. Thoſe Prophets, 1 *Cor.* 14. were to hear and learn of others, as well as to ſpeak themſelves. The Apoſtles had extraordinary gifts when Chriſt lived, though not in ſuch a plentifull and glorious manner as afterwards, and yet were ignorant of thoſe great and glorious truths of Chriſts death and reſurrection, *&c.*

Inſt. *But after his departure the people of Epheſus were ignorant of thoſe gifts of the Holy Ghoſt,* Acts 19. 1, 2.

Anſ. That might be, neither they nor *Apollo* might know diſtinctly what theſe gifts of the Holy Ghoſt were, and yet *Apollo* might have them; his face might ſhine and he not know it: As a man may be converted and yet not know that he is converted, nay poſſibly he may not clearly underſtand what the work of converſion is.

2. Whereas it is further ſaid, that *Apollo's might have a Commiſſion from* John *to preach.* They ſay, *Let them prove it that can, the Goſpel is ſilent as to that,* p. 71.

Reply 1. Our Brethren muſt remember the proof lies upon them to make good that he was not ordained, not upon us to prove that he was ordained: For if we lay down this poſition, That meerly gifted men ought not to preach, *&c.* if they offer any inſtances to the contrary, they muſt make this good, that ſuch were only gifted men, and not ordained: They are not ſo unacquainted with the laws of diſputation, as not to know that the proof lies on the opponents part, which they manage in this place.

2. The Goſpel is ſilent as to the Miſſion and Ordination of divers others: We reade nothing of the Ordination of *Titus*, of *Epaphroditus*, of the Paſtors of the ſeven *Aſian*

Aſian Churches, *Rev.* 2, & 3. Shall we therefore conclude they were not ordained?

3. Whereas it is ſaid he preached only where there was no Church: They ſay, *Let them prove that it is more unwarrantable to preach where a Church is, than where no Church is.*

Reply This will eaſily be proved by that *ingens telum neceſſitas:* I hope there is a far greater neceſſity of gifted mens preaching where Miniſters are not, than in a Church where they are.

4. To theſe I may adde, that we do not find *Apollo*'s preaching in a Chriſtian Church, but diſputing in a Jewiſh Aſſembly, a liberty which we as readily allow to gifted men, as to write in defence of the truth.

5. Say that *Apollo*'s were not ordained (which is all our Brethren can extort or deſire) yet this gives them no help at all, for the extraordinarineſſe of his gifts might well ſupply the defect of an Ordination, and that is no preſident for ſuch whoſe gifts are but ordinary.

And thus much for their firſt example.

The ſecond is that *locus* πολυφυλλικὸς, that famous inſtance of the *ſcattered Saints*, Acts 8. about which I ſhall not ingage my ſelf, nor detain the Reader with repeating thoſe various Anſwers that are given to it by the Provincial Aſſembly, which might eaſily be vindicated from their exceptions. I ſhall not ſtand upon this; That the perſons ſcattered were, if not ſolely, yet mainly the Officers of the Church, who might therefore preach, *&c.* But that which wholly invalidates this place as to their purpoſe, is that which is commonly ſaid, that this was an extraordinary caſe, a caſe of neceſſity. And mark the weight of our Brethrens deduction from this place: Becauſe the ſcattered Diſciples in a perſecuted ſtate of the Church, in a time when all Church-order was broke, preached and

taught

taught Jesus Christ to Heathens and unbelieving Jews, occasionally (it may be in private, or with *Paul* in the market places *&c.* or in their Synagogues disputing with them) therefore now unordained persons may preach publickly and solemnly to a Christian Church settled and constituted, wherein are plenty of able and godly Pastors, and where as their preaching is not necessary, so to many fearing God it is highly scandalous. This is the true state of the Argument, and if our Brerhren be not sick of this consequence, I shall say they have good stomacks.

But this must not passe so, and therefore they make an assault upon it, and there are three or four things which they say (lest they should say nothing) which stand in the room of Answers, with which I must professe I wonder how sober ingenious and conscientious men (such as I hope our Brethren are) can satisfie themselves. But such as they are we shall give them a fair hearing.

1. They say, *Persecution laid no necessity upon them to preach*, p.85.

Ans. Yes, it laid a necessity upon them, *i. e.* in order to Gods glory, and the salvation of souls, which could not be had without preaching, *Rom.* 10. and preaching could not now be had in an ordinary way; upon this supposition, that in those times God would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth, it was necessary that they should preach, for as much as there can be no salvation without preaching, *Rom.*10.

2. They say, *It is questionable whether necessity can make that lawfull, which is in it self unlawfull, as to forswear a mans self*, p.86.

Ans. There are two kinds of evil and unlawfulnesses, Some things are simply and absolutely evil, and *prohibita quia mala*, forbidden because they are intrinsecally evil; as to forswear, to blaspheam God, *&c.* and these no necessity

ceſſity can excuſe: But there are other things which are in themſelves indifferent, and only *mala quia prohibita*, are therefore only evil becauſe they are prohibited, and becauſe they are againſt poſitive precepts. Now thoſe things which are only evil this latter way (and ſuch is preaching without Ordination) they may, though not ordinarily, yet in caſes of neceſſity do. Thus in a caſe of neceſſity, *David* might eat the Shew-bread, the reſt of the Sabbath might be violated, *Periculum mortis pellit Sabbathum*: And of this kind is order in a State or Church, which is a duty to be obſerved ordinarily, and yet in caſe of evident neceſſity may be violated. And, as in a State, in ſuch a caſe, every man is a Conſtable, ſo in the Church, in ſuch a caſe, every man may be a Preacher.

3. They ſay, *It is an extraordinary caſe when Ordination cannot be had in Gods way*, i. e. *when Election doth not go before it*, p. 86.

Anſ. 1. That Election muſt neceſſarily and continually go before Ordination, is but one of their παραδοξα, and ſuppoſitions to be confuted hereafter.

2. And if ordinarily Election muſt go before Ordination, yet, as we ſay of preaching, when Ordination cannot be had, it may be done without it; ſo it is true of Election when it cannot be had, Ordination muſt be taken without it; and when Ordination cannot be had exactly in Gods way, as to all the particulars, it muſt be had, as it may. The Shew-bread was ordinarily according to Gods way, to be eaten by the Prieſts alone, but in caſes of neceſſity it might be eaten out of Gods way, it might be eaten by others.

3. It is not every extraordinary caſe that carries it, it muſt be a caſe of neceſſity, ſuch as this is not; for what if neither Election nor Ordination can be had by them in Gods way? There is no neceſſity of their preaching in a

Church which is constituted. And thus we see how firmly this Answer stands against all their exceptions, and that all their assaults are but like the beating of a storm against the wall. So that there is one flaw in their Argument which will for ever condemn it of insufficiency.

But that is not all: Mark how the Argument is laid by our Brethren; *Those who were scattered abroad they preached: But many unordained men were scattered abroad; Therefore many unordained men preached,* p.74.

Ans. 1. You shall see what an hopefull Argument this is: I will make use of their own Argument against them, and I desire no other Umpire.

They who were scattered abroad they preached: But many ungifted persons were scattered abroad; Therefore such preached: And because this example they bring as a president for us, therefore ungifted persons may now preach publickly; which because it is not only false, but contrary to their own sense, therefore (that we may not be put to deny the Conclusion) we must find fault with one of the premises, and that can only be done our way, *i. e.* by saying that, not all that were scattered preached, but only some of them preached: Only here is the difference, these some that preached, say we, were Officers; say they, they were gifted men, which yet they cannot prove, and if they could, it reacheth not our case, nor our times, for it was a case of necessity, as hath been argued.

If they like not this, I will put it in another dresse: They who were scattered, preached: But women as well as men were scattered, so they say, *the scattering was subsequent to* Pauls *haling men and women,* &c. and that *the All that were scattered, were not all the Officers, but all the Church.* So that by this Argument here is a warrant for women-preachers, if this example be a president: Nor let them fly to their usual refuge, that women are elsewhere

where forbidden, for although they were ordinarily prohibited, yet in cases of necessity (such as this was) they might do it, as that woman did who preached to the *Iberians*, and converted them.

To this I may adde, that all that can be extorted from this place is this, that they preached; which we may grant without any prejudice to our cause, for there are divers kinds of preaching or teaching, they might do it divers waies. It might be true of all, that they preached and taught Jesus, but not all alike, nor all in the same capacity; the Officers might teach publickly, the rest privately; the Officers constantly, the others occasionally; the Officers might preach officially in a Christian Church, the rest might discourse to a company of Heathens, or dispute with them; and all these may be called teaching or preaching. So that our Brethrens Argument is *a genere ad speciem affirmativè*, which will not hold water.

For what they say, that *It is indefinitely said that they that were scattered, preached.*

Ans. They know that indefinite propositions, *in materiâ contingenti*, in a contingent matter (such as this unquestionably is) are not equivalent to an universal: Supposing that Officers and people were scattered, I say, that if the Officers alone had preached, that had been sufficient ground to say of the whole they preached, as oftentimes that is said to be done by all *Israel*, which was done by the Officers of the Congregation.

And thus we have seen those two great topicks of our Brethren, from Scripture precept, and Scripture president overthrown. And so much for the third Argument.

Their fourth Argument is that principall place and pillar of their opinion, which if I shall satisfactorily Answer, there will be little ground left for our Brethrens

confidence in this cause. 1 *Cor.* 14.29,31. whence they draw this Argument,

All that are Prophets may publickly preach: But some men who are not ordained Officers, are Prophets; Therefore some men who are not ordained Officers, may publickly preach.

Which Argument may be cut off in a word, for their Conclusion may be granted without any detriment to our Cause; and our Brethren might have known, and ought to have considered, that we grant, that persons unordained may preach, in a double case; 1. In the case of necessity. 2. In case of extraordinary gifts, and an immediate Commission from God, which we take to be the case of these Prophets, of which more hereafter. In the mean time let us follow them: For their *major* it is granted on all hands: For their *minor*, it is this, *That some men who are not ordained Officers are Prophets*; where there is a double defect and insufficiency to the proof of what they intend. For 1. The Prophets might be Officers, though not ordained; so were the Apostles, neither of man nor by man. 2. If the Prophets were not Officers at all, yet the extraordinarineſse of their gifts was a sufficient warrant for the publick exercise thereof: But neither of these are to be found in the case of those unordained preachers we plead against, but they differ διὰ παντὸς from them, for neither are they Officers at all, ordained or not ordained; nor are their gifts extraordinary; so that the *minor* might be granted, and yet the truth not wronged. But let us see how they proceed: I fear it will prove *ominous* to them, thus to stumble in the threshold: They argue thus, to prove their *minor*, *All that have the gift of propheſie are Prophets: But some men who are not ordained Officers have the gift of propheſie*; Ergo, *Some men, who are not ordained Officers are Prophets.* For the *major*, though we grant it, yet, according to our Brethrens principles, it might

might be denied; for, if it were as they say, that those propheſiers here ſpoken of had the gift, but no Office, I ſhould deny ſuch to be Prophets, becauſe the name of Prophet, both in vulgar acception, and in Scripture uſe, connotes an Office; *Caiaphas* did propheſie, *Joh.* 11.—— and yet I beleeve our Brethren are not ſo hardy, as to ſay that *Caiaphas* was a Prophet. The *minor* will lead us to the main point, which is this, *Some men not ordained Officers have the gift of propheſie*; which they attempt to prove by three ſteps:

They ſay, this *propheſie* 1. *is a gift, not an Office*. 2. *That it is a gift ſtill continuing*. 3. *And which ſome unordained perſons have*, p. 90. And if theſe things be proved, they ſay ſomething to the purpoſe; but let it be conſidered, if there be a flaw in any one of them, their whole Argument fals, and how much more, when every one of them will be taken tardy. The laſt Propoſition they place firſt, and uſe three Arguments to prove it, whereof the laſt is that which the other propoſitions treat of, the two former are theſe which follow.

1. (Say they) *Some not ordained have this gift of propheſie, becauſe we find no Scripture warrant for the ordaining of Prophets.*

Anſ. 1. What if there be no particular warrant, it is ſufficient that there is a general rule for the ordaining of all Church-officers, Paſtors, Teachers, Elders, *&c.* and (at leaſt, if theſe be ordinary Officers, as our Brethren make them) a parity of reaſon (which is a ſufficient Argument to ſober minded men, ſuch as I take our Brethren to be) will prove that they alſo are to be ordained.

2. But if they be extraordinary Officers (as the Provincial Aſſembly affirm) preferred before the Evangeliſts, and having this priviledge above the Evangeliſts (for ought we read) to be immediatly and infallibly indued, *&c.*

then what wonder if in this they partake with the Apostles, who as they were not *of men*, so neither *by men*, and needed no Ordination, nor had it, unless in relation to some special work, as *Acts* 13.1.

2. (Say they) *They must be discerned to have the gift before they be ordained, and therefore some not ordained may have the gift of prophesie.*

Ans. This Argument is built upon the former mistake, as if there were a necessity of such a Prophets Ordination; whereas, I say, Gods indowment of him with extraordinary gifts, is a kind of Ordination, and supplies the defect of an Ordination by men. But (complying thus far with our Brethren, to own these Prophets to be unordained persons, and their gifts but ordinary) I further Answer, that this is wholly impertinent (as was intimated before) for in the case of a Pastor, the question is not, Whether one not ordained may have Pastoral gifts, which we assert he may have, nay he must have, and must be known to have them before he be ordained; but the question is, Whether a man not ordained may commonly and ordinarily exercise those Pastoral gifts, which is quite another thing: It is one thing to have gifts, another thing to exercise gifts. A man may lawfully have divers gifts, (*v.g.* of ruling an Army or a State, *&c.*) which yet he may not lawfully exercise.

But let us now come to their next Proposition, which is more to the purpose, *viz. That this prophecying is not an Office but a gift.* If this be proved, it amounts to something, but I doubt the premises will fall a mile short of the conclusion. I passe by the ἀκυρολογία they run into, which Dr. *Collins* takes notice of, and shall rather consider how they attempt to prove it; which they do by two Arguments.

1. *All who have the gift of prophesie are Prophets: But*

all

all that have the gift are not Officers.

Anſ. If theſe Prophets were ordinary perſons, I deny the *major*, for then beſides the gift, they muſt be ordained (as in other ordinary caſes:) But if theſe Prophets were extraordinary perſons, I deny the *minor*, for the very having of ſuch a gift extraordinarily inſpired, is an immediate call, and makes them extraordinary Officers, as it was in the Prophets of the old Teſtament.

Arg. 2. *That which ought in duty, and might in faith be coveted by every member of the Church of* Corinth, *was not an Office but a gift: For* 1. *God no where promiſed to make every one an Officer there.* 2. *This was impoſſible, for then all the body had been the eye; and if theſe were extraordinary Officers, much leſſe might they covet to be ſuch: But now this propheſying they ought and might covet in faith* v. 1. 39.

Anſ. 1. The *major* is denied: 1. An Office might be coveted as well as a gift, 1 *Tim.* 3. 1. *If a man* (Gr. εἴ τις, *if any man*) *deſire the Office of a Biſhop, he deſireth a good work.* Yea an extraordinary Office might be coveted, as is evident from the deſires and endeavours of the ſons of the Prophets in the old Teſtament.

2. Let our Brethren ſhew where God promiſed to every member of the Church of *Corinth* theſe extraordinary gifts, and I will ſhew them where God promiſed to every one of them to be Officers.

3. If extraordinary gifts might be deſired, (as our Brethren ſay) why not an extraordinary Office? If an extraordinary Office might not be deſired, this is either becauſe this is an Office, or becauſe it is extraordinary; not becauſe it is an Office, that hinders not but it may be coveted, as we have ſhewn; nor, becauſe it is extraordinary, for then extraordinary gifts might not be deſired. That extraordinary gifts might be deſired, appears from the very words cited by our Brethren, 1 *Cor.* 14. 1. *Deſire ſpiritual*

spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may propheſie; whence it is moſt evident, that not only propheſying, but the other gifts mentioned there, *i.e.* of tongues, interpretation, *&c.* were to be deſired: So that our Brethrens Argument is feeble to prove this to be an ordinary gift, becauſe it was to be deſired.

4 For every member in the Church of *Corinth* to be an Officer was not impoſſible: True, it was impoſſible for all to be Officers there in that Church, but not to be Officers in other places: And this I would deſire our Brethren to ruminate upon, whether, ſuppoſing, that all the members of the Church of *Corinth* might in faith deſire, and ſo obtain gifts fitting them for Office (which our Brethren grant) & ſuppoſing that the exigencies of the Church required their Office-relation, which might well have been in thoſe times, and that their being in other callings ought not to hinder it (as our Brethren ſufficiently intimate, *pag.* 53.) I ſay, whether, ſuppoſing theſe things, it were either impoſſible or unlawfull for every member of the Church of *Corinth* to deſire to be an Officer, where he might be ſerviceable to the Church: That in this caſe it is unlawfull or impoſſible, I ſuppoſe our Brethren will not readily ſay; and if they ſay it, nothing more eaſie then to diſprove it: And if they grant it to be poſſible and lawfull, then all their Argument fals to the ground, then every member ought in duty, and might in faith, covet, as to have gifts neceſſary for an Office, ſo (in due order and fit time) to be Officers, though not in that Church, yet in ſome Church, which is enough to our purpoſe. Adde to this that if this propheſie be an Office, this is no more then that wiſh of *Moſes* ſo much inſiſted upon, at leaſt according to their ſenſe of it, *I would that all the Lords people were Prophets.*

And thus I have ſhewn the inſufficiency of their proofs alleadged

alledged for the defence of their first and most considerable Position, *That the prophesying here spoken of, is a gift, not an Office*: This Position they uphold only by two Arguments, which I hope any ingenuous Reader will discern to be so farre answered, that they have no great reason to be confident upon these grounds: And yet I must intreat the Reader to consider, that here lies the great stresse of the cause; for if it be not a bare gift, (which you have seen our Brethren cannot prove) but an Office, then the preaching of these Prophets is no warrant nor example for the preaching of any that are not Officers: Now although I might acquiesce here, for as much, as, if any assert that these were barely gifted men, it lies upon them to prove it; yet, *ex abundanti*, there is a reason given, whereby it doth more then probably appear, that these Prophets were Officers. In the mean time, let this be remembred, that if we could not prove that these preachers, 1 *Cor.* 14. were Officers (no more then they can prove that they were only gifted persons) yet our cause stands unshaken, and all that would follow in that case would be this, that this place must be laid aside, both by our Brethren, and by us, as not demonstrative to the point in hand.

This being premised, I come to our Argument, which is taken from 1 *Cor.* 12. *Eph.* 4. where the Prophets are enumerated amongst Officers, and (which is most considerable) placed before the Evangelists. I know our Brethren think to blow away this with a breath.

They say, *Nothing can be gathered from the order of the words; seeing oft-times the worse is placed before the better; as* Priscilla *before* Aquila, *the woman before the man*, p. 95.

And thus far it is true, that the bare order is no sufficient argument to prove a priority in dignity; and that the same things are sometimes in Scripture placed first, some-

times last, so that in all cases the order is not to be regarded, and yet in some cases it is not to be slighted, especially when it is punctually observed, that wherever Prophets *in concreto* are mentioned, they are placed next after the Apostles, and that this is done so solemnly, and with such emphaticall words, 1 *Cor.*12.28. πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, *first Apostles, secondarily Prophets*, &c. And as it may fairly be collected, that the Apostles are the chief of these Officers, because generally they are placed first, and that the Pastors and Teachers are the lowest of them, because generally they are placed last, so also it is considerable (and I doubt not our Brethren would make good use of it, were it for their cause, as much as it is against it) that Prophets are generally placed in the second order.

For what they adde, *If Prophets be Officers*, 1 Cor.12. Eph.4. *then those places must be understood of extraordinary Prophets, who did foretell of future events, as* Acts 11. *yet this hinders not, but this propheſying*, 1 Cor.14. *may be only by gift*, &c.

Ans. 1. It was not the sole work of Office-Prophets, (that I may accommodate my discourse to our Brethrens conceptions) to foretell future events; for *Judas* and *Silas* as Prophets, did exhort, *Acts* 15.32.

2. To say that there should be two sorts of New-Testament-Prophets, the one by Office, the other by gift, as it is but a begging of the question, so it will by wise and indifferent Readers, be lookt upon but as *subterfuge*, and why may we not as well make two sorts of Apostles, two sorts of Evangelists, &c. the one by Office, the other by gift? It had been somewhat tollerable, if these in 1 *Cor.*14. had been said to Propheſie, but not called Prophets (*seeing*, as our Brethren say, *the doing of some Acts occasionally, as v. g. ones teaching occasionally, doth*

not

not denominate a man a teacher) but seeing they are also called Prophets, impartiall men will easily gather, that they are the same which are known by that name in other places. Thus much for the first Proposition, which being dispatched, I now come to the second, and shall try whether that succeed better in our Brethrens hands; and that is, That Prophesying is an ordinary gift, and still continuing in the Church. This they undertake to prove as followes:

Arg. 1. *Prophesying was in use, and no Gospel Rule can be shewed for the repeal or ceasing of it*, p. 96.

Anſ. *A gift may ceaſe in the Church two wales.* 1. Either by a positive act of God in his Word forbidding it: or 2. By a privative act of God in his Providence withdrawing it. Who knows not that the gift of Tongues, prædiction, and infallible explication of the Scripture is ceased? and yet it would be a most vain Argument to dispute against the ceſſation of it thus, because there is no Gospel-rule for the repeal of them.

Arg. 2. *This Prophesying is ordinary*, Ergo *still continuing*.

Anſ. The proposition is altogether needleſſe, for if it be ordinary that is sufficient, and indeed that is the Antitheſis of the assertion of the Provinciall Assembly (that this Prophesying is extraordinary) And therefore let us hear what they have to say, or what they alledge to prove it ordinary.

For the self-contradiction they say God hath left us to, p. 97. I shall only say this, Wise men before they had made such a bold charge (especially making use of the dreadfull Name of the Lord) would have understood the grounds of it, which indeed are none at all: for the Authours of the *Jus divinum regiminis Eccleſiaſtici*, were only three or four reverend City Ministers, whereof one or

two are since gone out of the City; and, not one of them was a member of the Provincial Assembly when the *Jus divinum Ministerii* came forth: And being different persons, though agreeing in the main of this controversie; it is no disparagement to any of them to differ in some circumstance: however all of them do agree in that which our Brethren here oppose, *i. e.* that the gift was extraordinary. Besides, I suppose, our Brethren would be hard put to it to prove that there is any contradiction, for these two may very well consist together, to say that these Prophets were extraordinary Officers in respect of their gift, and yet the ordinary Pastours of *Corinth* in regard of their Office and relation: And seeing there was a competent number of extraordinary Officers residing in that Church, it was most fit they should be the ordinary Pastours of that Church *quoad exercitium muneris*: And in this sense we may safely embrace both what the worthy Authors of that excellent piece *Jus divin. regim.* affirm, and also what learned Mr *Rutherford* asserts, *i. e.* that these Prophets were the ordinary Pastours of that Church and yet both grant, that for their gifts they were extraordinary, and that is the thing now in question: So that in stead of a contradiction feigned, here is a real agreement found out; all of us agreeing in the two principles which our Brethren here oppose: and all asserting, 1. That these Prophets were Officers. 2. That they were extraordinary as to their gifts: To which their special relation to *Corinth*, and residence there, and doing the acts of Pastours is no more a prejudice, than it was to the Apostles, who though they were extraordinary Officers, yet some of them at some times were as Pastours to some Churches, &c. which occasioned that apprehension that *James* was Bishop of *Jerusalem*, &c.

That this Propheſying was ordinary, our Brethren offer some Arguments to prove. Arg.

Arg. 1. *The rules to regulate the work are ordinary*, p. 100.

Anſ. I ſee no rule but what may very well agree to extraordinary Officers. Extraordinary Officers, 1. Muſt act orderly. 2. Muſt ſpeak in a known language. 3. Muſt ſpeak to edification. 4. Muſt be ſubject to the trial of other Officers, yea people alſo, as the Provincial Aſſembly fully proves; of which our Brethren take no notice: *Paul* commends the *Bereans* for examining his doctrine.

Arg. 2. *The work of theſe Prophets is ordinary*, i. e. *to ſpeak to edification and exhortation, and comfort.*

Anſ. 1. This alſo was the work of Apoſtles. 2. The work indeed was ordinary, but the manner of doing it was extraordinary, in as much as theſe did it infallibly, and by immediate revelation.

Arg 3. *But here is no mention of extraordinary work, of a gift of prædiction, which is required to all extraordinary Prophets, but the contrary is intimated, and this propheſying is here ſaid to be, not a ſign for them that believe not (which prædiction of events is) but for them that believe.*

Anſ. 1. *Date non conceſſo*, that theſe Prophers had not the gift of prediction, that no way hinders but they might be extraordinary Officers, for beſides this they had another extraordinary gift, to wit, a gift of infallible teaching by immediate revelation. Divers of the Apoſtles had not this gift of prædiction, that we read of, and yet I hope our Brethren will give them their paſſe for extraordinary Officers.

2. For my part I am prone to conceive (and let our Brethren diſprove it) that the prædiction of future events was rather a priviledge indulged to ſome New Teſtament Prophets, than common to all Prophets: The gift of miracles was a gift beſtowed upon Prophets, and yet ſome wanted it; for *John* (though a Prophet) yet did no miracle, *Joh.* 10. 41. However, the great and principal work

of these New Testament Prophets (and the old also) was preaching, &c. and therefore (although these Prophets, 1 Cor. 14. had the gift of prædiction) yet it is no wonder that the title of prophesying should be appropriated to the most common principal, and famous part of the work, which is preaching.

Analogum per se positum sumitur pro famosiore analogata.

3. And how poor an evidence is this to prove, that these Prophets could not foretell future events, because it is not mentioned in this Chapter? the rather because he here speaks of the Prophets, not in relation to unbeleevers (for whose sake the gift of prediction was given) but in relation to beleevers, and to the Church, and concerning the ordering of the work of prophesying or preaching in and to the Church-assembly.

4. We readily grant all which can be proved from this place, which is only this, that the preaching of these Prophets (for it is that act of the Prophets which is here called prophesying) is not for them that believe not, but for them that beleeve: It is not said, that these Prophets were given not for a sign to them that beleeve not, &c. (which had been more to the purpose) but that, that act of their Office there spoken of was not for a signe, &c.

5. If they had not that particular extraordinary gift of prædiction, yet had they divers other extraordinary gifts, as that of Tongues, and the interpretation of them, &c. and that was sufficient to make the persons extraordinary, though they wanted some other extraordinary gift.

Arg. 4. *Publick Prophesying extraordinary was allowed to women,* Luke 2.36,38. *But this publick Prophesying was not allowed to women,* v. 34. *let your women keep silence; Therefore this publick Prophesying was ordinary.* p. 102.

Ans. That extraordinary Prophesying was allowed to women in publick, either in the old or new Testament, hath been often said and supposed; but never yet could I see

see it proved, nor can one instance be given of it, that I know of; to wit, that any woman did preach in a publick Assembly; and there lies the streſſe: *Anna* might speak to all, *i. e.* severally, as they came by turnes to the Temple, and so might *Priscilla* occasionally speak privately, as she had opportunity: And indeed we read that when she preached, she chose to do it privately, *Act.* 18. But neither of them in a publick Assembly.

But that Argument is so fully handled by others, that I shall not need to dilate upon it here.

And thus we have seen how infirm our Brethrens Arguments are, which are brought to prove that this Propheſying was ordinary.

In the next place I should come to lay down Arguments to prove that it was extraordinary: I shall not insist upon all the Arguments used to prove it: Some were proposed by Dr. *Collings*, and are by him vindicated in his last piece, others I dare venture to stand upon their own legs, and refer the comparing of them and the Answers here given to any indifferent Reader: And besides, Dr. *Collings* hath eased me of that burden.

This only I take notice of, that *this Propheſying was by revelation*, v. 26. *Every one* (i. e. *of you Prophets*) *hath a Psalme, a Doctrine, a Tongue, a revelation, an interpretation.* And v. 30. *If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace.*

To which our Brethren answer two things.

1. They say, *All these enumerated were not extraordinary: A Doctrine is ordinary, the ordinary Elders have a Doctrine*, p. 103.

Reply. It is true of ordinary Officers, they had a Doctrine; it is true also of extraordinary Officers, they had a Doctrine, but not both in the same way, in the one it was extraordinary, in the other ordinary, so that from the

the bare mention of a Doctrine, it can neither be collected that that Doctrine was ordinary, nor that it was extraordinary, but that must be gathered from the circumstances of the place; and for this place, whereas the Office here spoken of is extraordinary (as we have proved) and the word Doctrine is at least ambiguous: It is more probable that this Doctrine is meant of an extraordinary kind (as the rest are which are there enumerated) than that it is meant of an ordinary Doctrine, when nothing else here spoken of s ordinary.

2. They say *that the word revelation is sometimes taken for a revelation in an ordinary way, that is by the word*, &c.

Ans. That is readily granted, and needed no proof, but it must be added that sometimes also it is taken in an extraordinary sense; so that now we are to enquire which way it is to be taken here, and which way the circumstances of the text restrain that common word: Now that it is meant of extraordinary revelation four things will procure belief with unbyassed Readers. 1. That the word is of the present tense, ἐὰν ἀποκαλυφθῇ, if it be revealed, not if it have been revealed, as it should have been, for the revelation of the word was past. 2. The posture in which it is revealed, when he sitteth by. 3. The effect of such a revelation, that it gives a stop to the others discourse: 4. That this revelation was not common to all the Church, but peculiar to these Prophets, and not common to all the Prophets neither, but peculiar to one, τῷ πρώτῳ, some one that sitteth by, and therefore surely it cannot be the revelation by the Word, which is common to all the Prophets, yea, all the Church. Nor is there any weight in what is further objected by our Brethren, that if this revelation should command silence to a Prophet speaking by immediate revelation, then the same Spirit should clash with it self: For though these Prophets did speak by immediate

mediate revelation, yet not so as that they did not at all exercise their ordinary gifts, or that they never spake as ordinary men: For even the Prophets and Apostles themselves, sometimes spake their own private opinions: And why might not these Prophets after the delivery of their revelation amplifie it, and open it according to their private opinion, by the help of their excellent, though ordinary gifts: which (though they were much to be valued and respected) yet well might be corrected by some immediate revelation manifested to another.

But (say they) *this requiring the first to hold his peace, doth not necessarily forbid his proceeding so far as he intended, or command a sudden silence, &c. but only commandeth so to contract a mans discourse, as there may be opportunity for others.*

And I confesse nothing is more easie then to dictate; This is soon said, but if you ask our Brethren for a proof, I am afraid they will stick in the mire: In the mean time, they having offered no proof for it, must needs allow me to rely as much upon my affirmation, which yet is not mine, but the Apostles, as they upon their negation. It is plain from the words, that it was a thing that fell out beyond expectation, and therefore is brought in conditionally, *If any thing be revealed*, which condition was needlesse, if the revelation spoken of was ordinary and common. And this may be abundantly sufficient for the Vindication of this place, from which I may justly expect this fruit, that ingenuous men of a contrary mind to us, may abate some of their confidence, and see cause to make a further enquiry into this point then yet they have made.

And this may suffice for Answer to their Arguments, whereby they attempt to prove that gifted persons may preach. Let us now see, whether we have not more con-

vincing Arguments to prove that they may not preach: Albeit this must needs be said, that in course of disputations, it is not incumbent upon us to prove the Negative, but upon them to prove the Affirmative, *Affirmanti incumbit probatio.* So that I might here take take up, and having shewn the invalidity of their Arguments, I might *supersede* further trouble: And this *memorandum* I shall leave upon the file, that this Assertion of our Brethren, *That unordained persons may preach ordinarily,* is neither commanded by any Gospel precept, nor countenanced by any Gospel example (which hitherto hath been alleadged.) But because our Arguments, whereby we have proved our Assertion, are assaulted by our Brethren, it will be convenient to say something by way of Vindication.

CHAP. VII.

THe first Argument is put into our hands by the Apostle, and it is *Rom.* 10. 15. *How shall they preach except they be sent?* i. e. *How can they do it lawfully?*

The summe of our Brethrens Answer lies in this, *That the mission here spoken of, is not Ministeriall, whereby they are constituted in their Office; but providentiall, whereby they are sent into any place: and that this mission is indeed necessary to preaching,* i. e. *naturally, not morally; As it is true, How can a man preach except he have health, strength,* &c. *And besides, it may be morally necessary, and yet not constitutive of a Minister: For it is morally necessary to a Ministers preaching,* i. e. *lawfully, that he have all the Gospel qualifications required to a Preacher, and yet though he want some of these, he may be constituted a Minister.*

To which I Reply, 1. To the last clause, there is an apparent fallacy, which will plainly appear by this one distinction,

distinction, That a mans preaching may be unlawfull two waies; 1. Circumstantially, when there is a defect in the principles, or in the manner of acting, &c. 2. Substantially, when there is a defect in the substance of the act, both as to the matter and manner of it: When a Minister wants some necessary qualification, &c. he preacheth lawfully for the substance of the act, though he sins in the manner of acting; but when one that preacheth wanteth mission, the very substantial act of preaching is unlawfull. As when a Magistrate acts vainglorioously, he sins in the manner of his acting, but his act is lawfull in it self; but when a man usurps the power of a Magistrate, there he sins in the substance of the act, because he wants authority, &c. Or as it is in the case of the Lords Supper, it is wholly unlawful for a scandalous sinner to receive it, but it is lawfull for a regenerate man (though weak in grace) to receive it, though he sins in the receiving of it. In a word, the act is lawfull, *quoad specificationem actus*, for the kind of it, and *per se*; though it is sinfull, *quoad exercitium actus*, in the exercise of it, and *per accidens*.

2. It must be granted that the word sending is *vocabulum multivocum*, taken variously in divers places. Sometimes it is taken for the mission of a person already authorized to any place or people, but sometimes also it is taken for the authorization of a person to a work or office, yea, so it is frequently taken, as *Joh.* 20. 21. *As my Father hath sent me, so send I you*, &c. As the Father authorized and sealed me to the Office of a Mediator, so do I authorize you to be Apostles, &c. 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. *Christ sent* (i.e. commissionated *me*) *not to baptize, but to preach.* John 1. 6. *A man sent of God.* Thus Christ often said, that *he was sent*, in Answer to that Question of his enemies, *By what authority doest thou these things?*

3. This providential mission, and Ministerial mission need

need not to be opposed to one another, but may well consist together: A providential sending of a Minister to any place (such as that of *Paul*, Acts 16. to *Macedonia*) doth not at all exclude, but rather presuppose a Ministerial mission, that *Paul* was an Apostle before hand. Nay indeed upon further search these will be found to be much coincident: *How can they preach unless they be sent?* Sent, by whom? They say, by God: Well then, we must enquire in the Scripture how God sends Preachers: Thus much is apparent, that God sends them by some call (distinct from the gifting of them.) Whether this call be by people, or by Officers, that is another dispute, which now I shall not meddle with; this is sufficient to our purpose, A call authorizing men to preach, is that whereby God sends men to the work of preaching: If they were extraordinary Officers, then God sent them oft-times immediatly; if ordinary, then God sent them by the ministry and mediation of men: And all those that were providentially sent by God to any place, were called either one way or the other; And this calling or designation of them to their office and work, is that which is commonly known by the name of Sending. This authorization of *Isaiah* is called the sending of him, *Isa.* 6. So it is called sending by *Moses*, Exod. 4. And this sending is that which is denied to the false Prophets, *Jer.* 23. 21. *I have not sent them*; were this meant of a providential sending, this were not true, for so God did send them; and therefore the meaning is, I did not authorize them. In this sense also Christ bids us pray the Lord, *that he would send forth labourers into his harvest*: How send them? for that, let Christ's example interpret Christ's words, *He sent forth the twelve*; *Matth.* 10. *i. e.* by giving them Command and Commission: So *Luke* 10. 1. *After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them*—— And conformable to this,

this, was the example of the Apoſtles, who uſed to ſend men into the Miniſtry, by faſting and prayer, and laying on of hands; and this way of Sending is granted on all hands, our Brethren cannot deny it: But for another way of ſending that remains yet to be proved. Hitherto we have had no example of it, as hath been ſeen.

4. Let it be conſidered that our Brethren obſerve that this is brought in as a juſtification of the calling of the Gentiles, and of the ſending of Preachers to them by the Apoſtles, which the Jews grumbled at: Upon which I ground this inference, That the *cannot* here, *How can they preach unleſſe they be ſent*, muſt be underſtood of a moral impoſſibility, and not of a natural impoſſibility, as our Brethren would have it: For if it be taken of a natural impoſſibility, it is falſe, for though the Apoſtles had not ſent them, they might have gone of their own accord, or ſome other way: But if you take it for a moral impoſſibility, it runs ſmoothly; Whereas you Jews grumble at us for ſending Preachers to the Gentiles, we do no more then what is neceſſary; for ſeeing God hath promiſed that the Gentiles ſhall be ſaved by calling upon the Lord, and they cannot call on God without beleeving, nor beleeve without hearing, nor hear without preaching, nor preach without ſending, *i. e.* not preach lawfully, unleſſe they be ſent, either by an immediate call, or elſe by us or others, who are authorized by God for that work, and therefore we are not to be blamed for ſending of them.

Exc. *But* (ſay they) *all the other interrogations are to be underſtood of a natural impoſſibility; It is naturally impoſſible for one to call upon him on whom he beleeves not, or to beleeve on him of whom he hears not*, &c. *and that this only is meant of a moral impoſſibility, will be hard to conclude.*

But the Answer is easie, That it is a very frequent thing in Scripture, for the same word to be used in divers senses; as, *Let the dead* (*i. e.* spiritually) *bury the dead* (*i. e.* corporally.) And (to keep to the very phrase) the word *cannot* is thus used, *Jer.*13.23. *Can the Æthiopian change his skin?* &c. There is a natural impossibility, *then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil*, there is a moral impossibility: So in that comparison of our Saviour, *A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit*, there is a natural impossibility; *How can ye being evil, speak good things*, here is a moral impossibility.

5. If this be only a providential mission, by which these Preachers are here said to be sent, then none at all are excluded; nay the very devils themselves, if they should preach Christ (as they did sometimes in possessed persons) must necessarily be taken into the number of the Preachers here spoken of, (for even such would be providentially sent) then which what can be more absurd. And I wish our Brethren would duly consider that there is a necessity of granting one of these two things; either that the devils may be the Preachers here spoken of, or that the mission here spoken of is not providential.

I shall adde no more upon this account, only there are some Arguments which they offer to prove that this mission here spoken of is not constitutive of a Minister.

1. They say, *The Apostles were Officers and yet had mission afterward*, Mat.28.19.

Ans. 1. Officers indeed they were while Christ lived, they were constituted Preachers, *Matth.*10. but they were not Apostles of the Gentiles untill *Matth.*28. and therefore it is not strange that when they were inaugurated to that new and solemn work, they had a new and solemn mission.

2. This

2. This Argument is founded upon the ambiguity of the word *sent*, or *mission*, which sometimes is taken for a mans authorizing to a work, and so they had but one mission to one kind of work; sometimes for a bare disposall of them to this or that particular place or work, and in this case they might have a hundred missions: God sent *Paul* to *Macedonia*, and to *Corinth*, and to *Rome*, &c. yet surely our Brethren will not make all these to be several missions in the sense of the present dispute.

2. *Mission* (they say) *may be repealed (so cannot a call to an Office:)* Mat. 10. & 28. *compared.*

Ans. That is taken off already: The Apostles had in each place a distinct call to a distinct work.

3. They say, *The seventy Disciples had mission to preach, who were not Officers that we find.*

Ans. 1. This is a contradiction, for if they had a mission from Christ, that made them Officers, at least *protempore*; for what is the making of one an Officer, but a solemn designation of him for that work, by a person impowred to authorize him.

2. They might be Officers, though we do not reade of it.

4. They say, *Then the instructions of none can be usefull to work faith, but of Officers only; for this hearing is necessary to beleeving.*

Ans. That follows not, for though the only ordinary means of begetting faith, is the hearing of a Gospel-Minister, yet God is not bound up, he may and doth oft times use private instructions of private men to that end: And as it follows not, that it is simply impossible for a man to beleeve that heareth no Preacher, because the Apostle saith, *How shall they hear without a Preacher?* (seeing God may work faith by immediate inspiration) so it follows not that it is simply impossible for any man

to

to be converted by hearing of one who is not ordained, &c. because the Apostle saith, *How shall they preach unlesse they be sent?* But this only follows from both, that the hearing of a Preacher sent, is the only ordinary means of working faith and salvation.

But we must not part thus, our Brethren adde that this text is not cogent, because *though it did prove a necessity of a mission, yet it doth not prove a necessity of ordination (which was the thing to be proved) seeing this mission is not Ordination.*

Ans. I shall not contend about words, nor is it pertinent to enter into a particular dispute about Ordination. This is sufficient for our purpose, this mission is not the bare gifting of them, but it is an authorizing of them to the work, or the giving of them commission to preach: Now there are but two Scripture wales of giving men commission to preach that we know of, the one extraordinary, from God immediatly (which our Brethren have too much modesty to pretend) the other ordinary, by men setting them apart to that work (whether the Officers set them apart in the Name of Christ, or in the Name of the Church, all is one as to this question) it sufficeth us that some solemn designation or setting apart is necessary, and that gifted men may not preach meerly because they are gifted, unlesse they have some further call or mission; which although our Brethren here seem to grant, (in saying that the bare gifting of men is not the sending of them) yet indeed they are obliged to deny by vertue of their interpretation of that Text, 1 *Pet.* 4. 11. where the meer having of that gift is propounded as a sufficient ground to put a man upon the use of it.

But however let us hear what they have to prove that this mission is not Ordination.

1. They say, *We cannot find it.*

Ans.

Ans. If you cannot finde it in expresse terms, yet others have found it in clear consequences.

2. *Then Deacons are sent, for they were ordained,* Acts 6. 6.

Ans. Very true, Deacons were sent and had mission: What advantage can our Brethren pick out thence?

3. *Mission may be repeated.*

Ans. That was answered before.

4. *A Parochial Presbytery, if sufficient,* &c. *may ordain one for that Church, but they cannot send one to themselves.*

Ans. 1. That Presbytery doth not send an Officer in such a case to themselves, but to the Church, and so there is a sufficient distinction between the person sending, and the person sent.

2. A locall distinction is not necessary between the person sent, and the persons to whom a man is sent. *Isaiah* was sent to the whole house of *Israel*; now put case *Isaiah* be in the Temple when he is sent, and with him divers Jews, I say, he is in Scripture phrase sent as well to those that are locally present, as to those that were absent.

5. They adde, *That mission is propounded as the end of Ordination,* Mark 3. 14. *And he ordained twelve, that — he might send them forth to preach.*

Ans. 1. The strength of this Argument lies in the ambiguity of the word *send*, which, as we readily grant, sometimes it signifies a locall mission to a place, so again, at other times it signifies a constitutive mission to an Office.

2. Though the words in the English make some shew for them, yet indeed if one look into the Greek, it is but a meer shew, for it is not [illegible], but [illegible], *acquisivit, comparavit*, he got, procured, took twelve into his family, bred them up under his roof, that he might fit them

for, and so send them into the work of the Ministry; so that indeed the word whereby their Ordination is signified, is plainly that of *sending*; and the other, however it came to be rendred by our Translators, *he ordained* (who neither meant it in such a sense as our Brethren do, nor ever dreamed that it would be so made use of) yet indeed signifies nothing but barely the taking of them into his family, his constituting of them members of his family, and not his ordaining of them to be Officers in his Church. And thus I have dispatched all that hath any moment, which is alleadged by our Brethren, as to this place.

There are divers other things they adde, which being lesse material, I may trust the judgement of any common Reader with them; as when they say, *It is not a Church, nor a Presbytery, but Christ who sends Ministers*: Which if they understand thus, that Christ only doth it, [illegible] soveraignly, authoritatively, they have not us for their adversaries; but if they so mean it (as they must, or else it is nothing to the purpose) that men cannot send [illegible] Ministerially, it is too grosse to be believed by any man that reads the New Testament, and therein finds so many rules and examples of Gods sending by the Ministry of men, as *Acts* 6. *Acts* 13, &c.

So when they say, *That the mission of Ministers is not by a Presbytery, but by the Word; and that Christs command to go and preach, is a mediate calling to all lawfull preachers, though no Presbyters should urge it upon them; and that a Presbytery only sends in a Doctrinal way, as a private Christian also may do, by saying*, Go and Teach.

Where we have almost as many absurdities as words.

1. Two things are opposed that ought to be conjoyned, to wit, the Agent and the Rule, the Presbytery sends, but this they must do according to the Word.

2. All manner of calling, either by a Presbytery, or by a Church,

a Church, is made wholly superfluous; For they here plainly affere, that Christ's saying, *Go preach*, is a calling and a mediate calling to all lawfull Preachers, and that gifted men are lawfull Preachers, is their great businesse to prove; and if they say a call is further necessary, here is a call reaching to all gifted men: I am much mistaken if many of their own Brethren of the Congregational way, will not reject and abhor such loose affertions as these.

3. They allow as much to a private Christian, as to a Presbytery, both of them send in a doctrinal way. But the very mention of these Paradoxes is an ample Confutation.

And thus much for the first Argument.

CHAP. VIII.

THe second is taken from *Heb.*5 4,5. *No man taketh this honour*, &c. *but he that is called of God*——

To this they Answer two things.

1. *If this prove a call, yet it proves not a call by imposition of hands, which is that they contend for.*

Ans. We are not now medling with that particular kind of call, nor is this place alledged to prove it, but only to prove this in the general, that notwithstanding the highest gifts and qualifications fitting them for any Office, they must also have a call and designation to that Office, and that remains unshaken by all that they have said.

2. They say, *he speaks not of Gospel Ministers, but of Priests, and of the high Priests only, which are an higher order than Ministers, and prefigured Christ, and it follows not, because a call was necessary to the highest order of Officers, therefore it must be necessary to an inferiour order.*

Reply 1. Let me take the boldnesse to question whether

ther the Gospel Ministers are an inferiour order to the high Priest or no? If it be affirmed upon this ground, because they are types of Christ, then upon that account the inferiour Priests were of an higher order. (That I say not, the goats, and sheep, and buls, &c. which also were types of Christ.) If this be the reason, because they expiated sin, they did it only Ministerially and Declaratively, and by typifying and applying the true expiatory sacrifice; and that also is the Office of a Gospel-Minister, *Joh.* 20.23. *Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted.* — However it is, sure I am the Lord Jesus doubts not to preferre *John the Baptist* before all the old Testament Officers, and that in regard of his work, and to preferre the meanest New Testament Minister before him.

2. If the work of the high Priest was higher, and that must be weighed on the one hand, then let it be weighed on the other hand, that the gifts of Christ were more glorious. And this assertion I may venture to lay down, that Jesus Christ had more warrant to undertake the highest Office in the Church without a call, than one who is but ἀνθρωπος a meer man hath to take the meanest Office without a call.

The third and fourth Arguments I shall omit, because there is nothing that I find in our Brethrens Answer, which will need a Reply.

The fifth Argument is taken from *those rules laid down about the calling of men into the Ministry, and about the tryall of their qualifications, and one main reason of it was this, that false Doctrine might be prevented,* 1 Tim. 1. 3, 4. Tit 1.5, 9, 10.

To this they Answer, 1. *This concludes for the ordaining of Officers only, not against the preaching of gifted brethren, who lay no claim to the Office.*

Reply. The best clew for the guiding of us in the interpretation

pretation of every Law is the reason of the Law: Now if one great reason why the Apostle was so carefull to try and approve of Officers, &c. was this, to prevent false Doctrine; then upon the same account, he was obliged to be as careful to try all Preachers, for else he had made a hedge about the sheep, and yet left one gap open, which indeed was enough to frustrate the design of the hedge: What if none be allowed to be shepheards by Office, but such as are called, will it not be of as bad consequence, if the wolves be allowed to take upon them the exercise of the shepheards work? We see by experience, some gifted men preaching occasionally and disseminating their pernicious opinions, have done more to poison the people, than an able Minister by his instant and diligent labours could do to preserve and nourish them. What is the ground of the Apostles strictnesse in admitting men into the Ministry (*Lay hands suddenly on no man*) but this, the difficulty and importance of the work? And what work is more difficult and important than that of preaching, to do it as becomes the Gospel? *Paul* prefers it before the rest, 1 *Cor.* 1. And in regard of this work, it is that he cries out, *Who is sufficient for these things?* 2 Cor. 2.16. So that it were a strange incongruity and self-contradiction for the Apostle to use so much care in the constitution of Office-Preachers, and yet to be wholly careless as to another sort of Preachers, who may preach frequently (yea as often as the other, according to our Brethrens Principles) without coming under such a harsh and ungratefull examination and ordination.

2. They say, *There ought to be care to chuse Officers that are sound in the Faith, but this the people must look to in election.*

Ans. But this relieves them not, for what care shall be taken as to their gift-Preachers, who may preach without

the Churches election, nay are under a command to preach, as they are pleased to expound 1 Pet. 4. a command of God I say, which no man can dispense with: I know our Brethren say, that *to a mans exercise of his gifts in this or that place, there is required a call from the people or the Magistrate*, p. 149. But this will not help them; for I demand, whether in case the Apostles had neither been called by people nor Magistrate, Whether that had been a sufficient discharge to them from the execution of their Office? I trow not: Nay they preached when they were forbidden; and why? but for the reason now mentioned, to wit, that they were under a command of God, which no mortal man could dispense with: And therefore if gifted men are under a like command, pressed with the highest penalties, to preach (as our Brethren say) they may and must preach, though they have no call, neither from people nor Magistrate.

The sixth Argument I am sure will stand upon its own legs, taken from that confusion which will necessarily come into the Church by this means, which indeed the sad experience of our Church in these daies doth so unquestionably demonstrate, that I shall need to confute him that denies it, only as the Philosopher did confute him that said there was no motion by walking before him; so I shall only point him unto reall Arguments, and desire him to make use of his own eyes, reason and observation, and he will quickly be of the same opinion.

But these Arguments were not directly levied against our Brethren, (whom we acknowledge to be more sober) but against such as pleaded for a promiscuous assumption of the Office. The next Position laid down by the Provincial Assembly indeed doth more nearly concern them, which is this, *That none may do the work of the Ministry without Ordination.*

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

AND to this purpose they urge eight Arguments, which to me still seem very considerable, and my perswasion is, that if any judicious man of another minde, could but redeem himself from the prevailing power of prejudice, and duly ponder our Arguments and their Answers, he will find that all the assaults they make against them are vain and ineffectual: But it shall not be taken upon my word.

I will 1. propound our Arguments. 2. Take notice of their Answers; wherein I promise them not disingenuously to conceal or neglect any thing wherein their strength lies. 3. I shall adde something (where it is needfull) for the vindication of those Arguments.

Arg. 1. *That work, for the doing of which, God hath designed special Officers of his own, neither ought, nor may be done by any others; But God hath designed special Officers for this work of preaching.*

The *minor* is granted; but all the doubt lies about the *major*, and that is the Proposition which our Brethren deny, and they give three instances to the contrary; *Prayer is the special work of Ministers*, Acts 6. 4. *We will give our selves to prayer: And so is exhorting and reproving*, &c. Tit. 1. 5, &c. *Distribution of worldly goods is the Deacons work, and yet others may Pray, Exhort and Rebuke, give Alms*, &c.

Reply 1. For Prayer, it is true, it is the duty of all men, and of Ministers more than others, but that it was a work for which the Office of the Ministry was appointed, neither doth this text assert, nor did ever any man dream, and so that is wholly impertinent to the case in hand: One may as well say, that the Office of the Ministry was designed

signed for the work of hospitality, because they especially must be given to hospitality, 1 *Tim.*3.2. as to say, that it was designed for the work of prayer, because they especially must give themselves to prayer.

2. For the Deacons work, that is not barely the distribution of worldly goods, but the distribution of the Churches goods (which our Brethren here do either subtilly or unwarily, which I rather think, confound) and this latter none but the Deacon may do, so that this may be retorted upon them, that as the appointment of the Deacon for that work of distributing the Churches almes, is a sufficient reason to prove that no private man ought to do it, so also is the appointment of a Minister, for the work of preaching, a sufficient intimation that other persons may not undertake that work.

3. For that work of reproving and exhorting, they may do it, but privatly, not publickly.

Against this our Brethren object two things.

1. *If an Officer rebuketh a member in private, this he doth as an Officer, so that the publickness of an act is not necessary to make it an act of Office.*

Reply. This depends upon a meer mistake. It is one thing to say the publickness of the act of exhorting, *&c.* makes it an act of Office, or that a publick act is an act of Office, that we affirm. It is another thing to say that no act but a publick act is an act of Office (as our Brethren mistake it) this we affirm not, nor is it for our purpose to assert it; nay, we assert that an Officers private rebuke is an act of Office.

2. They say, *If it be the different way and manner of acting, that maketh an act to be an act of Office, then their Argument concerns not the work it self, but the manner of working, and so all which it proves is this, that none ought to do the Officers work in the same manner as he doth it,* i. e. *not officially,*

officially, and this we readily grant.

Reply. Our Argument concerns the work, but then it must be the work in question, and that our Brethren well know was not exhorting in general, but publick exhorting: But of this more hereafter. It must now be remembred, that the Provincial Assembly confirmed the *major* by three Arguments.

The first was this, Because *God hath severely punished such as have done those works, for which he hath appointed special Officers, as* Saul, Uzzah.

To this our Brethren Answer two things.

1. *That these were cases of necessity, and so if they prove any thing, they prove that gifted men may not preach, no, not in a case of necessity, which is allowed by your selves.*

Reply. The case is not parallel, nor is the necessity alike, of Preaching and Sacrificing; Preachiug (as our Brethren will grant) is absolutely necessary to salvation, so is not Sacrificing; nor was Sacrificing necessary in that case for *Israels* deliverance (if God had denied an opportunity of sacrificing) I conceive the parallell will lie right between their sacrifices and our Sacraments, neither of which are necessary to salvation, *necessitate medii.* And hereby the Argument will receive further light and strength, *i. e.* Because God hath appointed peculiar Officers for the administration of our Sacraments (as well as their Sacrifices) therefore they ought not to be administred by persons out of Office, no, not in any case of a pretended necessity (forasmuch as there is no absolute and real necessity of either Sacrifices or Sacraments to salvation.) And thus far our Brethren must consent with us, unless they will turn grosse separatists, and allow a liberty also for gifted men to administer the Sacraments, which I am confident they will not.

2. They say *the case is not alike; for there was an expres*

prohibition of these acts to any, except Officers, Num. 4. 15. & 16. 40. Numb. 1. 5. & Numb. 18. 22, 23. *The preaching of gifted men is not thus forbidden: And besides, not only the manner but the matter of these workes were forbidden to others.*

Reply. A thing may be prohibited two waies, either in expresse terms, or by solid consequence: I suppose our Brethren are far from that dotage which divers Anabaptists and Socinians run into, that we are not to be satisfied with Scripture consequences, but to look for expres Scripture, as if men must not beleeve what God saith, unlesse he speak it in their way: There are many things confessedly unlawful, which are not prohibited in expres terms, but only by some general rules and Scripture consequences: What if I should keep to the instance of *Uzzah?* who was punished not principally, at least not solely, because he did touch the Ark with his hands, but because he did not bear it upon his shoulders; which the Levites were to do: Now (I say) as in this case, Gods command that the Ark should be carried upon the Levites shoulders, was a command that it should be carried so only, and it was a prohibition to the Levites or any other, to carry it any other way; so in our case, Gods appointment of Officers to preach, is a prohibition to others to invade that work. Again, let me make this supposition (which no ingenuous man can disallow of,) Suppose that *Paul* had not expresly prohibited women to preach, I desire our Brethren to answer me, whether, in that case, it had been lawfull for gifted women to preach publickly or no: If they say *yea*, then I argue thus against them, that *Paul* doth not establish a new Law, but revives and interprets an old Law, 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. *Let your women keep silence — for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as saith the Law.* So that it was forbidden by the Law before that time, and

and had been unlawful, though *Paul* had never prohibited it. If they say, *no*, then I argue thus, that an expresse prohibition is not necessary, for such there had not been in the case supposed, nor had women been prohibited any other way but thus, Preaching was committed unto certain men in authority, commissionated for that work: *Ergo*, it was prohibited to persons under authority, and because all women are under authority, therefore are they universally excluded from this work: I add further, that it is a granted case in the businesse of the Sacraments, the administration whereof is prohibited to all un-officed persons (our brethren themselves being Judges) and how prohibited? There is no more an expresse prohibition to restrain men from administring the Sacraments, then from preaching, but only it is therefore judged prohibited, because God had appointed Officers for the doing of that work, and therefore implicitly prohibited the doing of it by others; and surely the prohibition doth equally concern both preaching and administring the Sacraments by others, forasmuch as both the manner of prohibition is the same in both, and the reason of the prohibition, to wit, because Officers were appointed by God for those works: And thus I have vindicated the first proof of the *major*, wherein I have been the larger, because it is a principal point, and because what our Brethren excepted had some colour of reason, although I am not without hope, that our Brethren themselves by this time may see, that it was a colour only, and no substance.

2. The *major* was proved thus, *That otherwise the Officers God hath appointed are made void, or at least unnecessary and insufficient.*

To this they say, *This will prove as strongly that Officers are unnecessary, at least to the work of private exhortation, seeing private Christians may do it.*

Reply. It is very true, and naturally follows, that because private Christians may reprove privatly, therefore there needed no peculiar Officers to be set apart for that work of private reproving, and if that were the whole work of a Minister, there would need no Officers for the work of the Ministry: But because there is another, and an higher work of the Ministry, which private Christians may not do, *i. e.* the work of publick preaching, therefore it is that there are Officers appointed for it.

3. *Hereby the order instituted by God in the Church is confounded.*

To this they say, *It is not. As a Fathers teaching of his children doth not destroy the order of Schoolmasters, nor take away the distinction between Master and Schollar,* &c.

Reply. It is true that a Father teaching privately, doth not destroy the relation of a Schoolmaster and Schollar, but if Fathers did, and might promiscuously teach in a publick way, this would destroy, or at least much prejudice that comely order. In like manner, that a Father or any Christian teach others privatly, is no way prejudicial to publick teaching, but eminently subservient to it, and we heartily wish it were more conscientiously and diligently practised; but if publick teaching were promiscuously allowed to all gifted men (whether Masters or Schollars) surely this would be repugnant to the order instituted by Christ, that one member of Christs body should usurp the acts of another. And thus much shall suffice for the vindication of the first Argument used by the Provincial Assembly.

The second Argument was this, *No religious service may be performed by any persons not appointed, nor warranted thereunto: But persons gifted are not appointed nor warranted thereunto.*

Our Brethren deny the *minor*, they say, *gifted persons are appointed to preach*, Against this, was argued as follow-

eth,

eth, *If they are appointed to preach, then every gifted man that preacheth not is guilty of a sin of omission.* To this they answer, *he is not guilty, if he want an opportunity, a call from others to exercise his gifts.*

Reply. I would gladly know whether the Apostles had been excused if they had refused to preach at all, for want of a call from men to preach; What if both Magistrates and people had not desired them to preach, whether did this give them a *supersedeas* or no? If they say it did, I suppose many are not of their mind, I am sure for one, that was *Peter*, when he was not only not call'd to preach, but forbidden to preach, yet he accounted it his duty to preach, *Act.* 5.29. *We ought to obey God rather than men.* If they say it did not discharge them from preaching, then I demand why it did not; surely all the account which can fairly be given of it must be this, They were by God appointed and obliged to preach, and therefore no men can dis-oblige them: And upon the same ground, if gifted men were appointed by God for that work, the negligence of men not desiring them, (provided they would permit or hear them), would not dis-oblige them: Add to this, that whatever gifts a man hath, he is bound to exercise them wherever he can (where he is not restrained, and put under some kind of impossibility of doing it) whether he be desired or no: A Christian having received a gift of private instruction, he is obliged to instruct persons not only when they desire him, but when they do not, whenever he can have conveniency and opportunity so to do: And in like manner (if our Brethren say true, that all gifted men as such, are appointed by God to preach) if a man have a gift of publick instruction, he is obliged to use it whenever he can be permitted so to do, and not only when others call him to the exercise of his gift. And this is the more forcible against them, because

they reduce those preaching gifts unto the talents spoken of *Mat.*25. which talents whoever useth not, is under a most dreadfull curse and communion: Now, as it is in other talents, if a man have received riches, honour, parts, interest, *&c.* he must use and exercise them for Gods glory, whether he be desired or no; so in like manner according to their hypothesis, his preaching talent must be laid out, whether the people desire it or no.

Our third Argument was this, *No man may do the Office of a Magistrate or Deacon, who is not called to it:* Ergo *none may do the Office of a Minister, who is not called thereunto.*

To this Argument they Answer divers things.

1. *If this Argument hold, then, as no man that is no Magistrate, may do one act of the Magistrates, so no man that is not ordained, may do* one *act of the Minister, he may not preach once, though as a probationer, which is against our Brethrens own principles.*

Ans. There is a double flaw in this discourse; For,

1. There is not *Par ratio*, there is not equal necessity of mens trials in order to both works: It is necessary a Minister should do the work of a Minister, *viz.* Preach in order to his Trial and Ordination to that work. But it is not necessary a man should do the work of a Magistrate in order to his trial, for his abilities may be fully known other waies.

2. In cases of necessity private men may do the work of the Magistrate: It is proper to the Magistrate to take away a mans life, and yet in a case of necessity, as if a private man be assaulted by a Rogue upon the high-way, it is lawfull for him, if he can, to take away his life.

2. They Answer, *Care may be taken otherwaies, there may be approbation without Ordination.*

Reply. It is true, men may devise twenty waies of their own,

own, as indeed there is a marvellous proneneſſe in men to ſet up their own deviſes in Gods worſhip; and whenever they are convinced of the neceſſity of uſing any means in order to an end, rather to contrive means and waies of their own, than to uſe ſuch as God hath already appointed, which, I fear, is our Brethrens miſcarriage here: God hath appointed an Ordination, and an examination and approbation in order to Ordination, and of Ordination the Scripture ſpeaks more clearly and frequently, than of any other approbation; nor do I remember that ever it ſpeaks of the approbation of any Preachers, but in order to Ordination; our Brethren have forſaken this Inſtitution of God, and introduced a new device, of approbation without Ordination. And becauſe the occaſion here leads me to it, I cannot but take notice of one thing, whereas I am informed ſome perſons, through careleſneſſe or oſcitancy, or wilfulneſſe, or ignorance, have taken up this conceit, that an Approbation from the *Commiſsioners* appointed for the tryall of Publick Preachers, is a kind of Ordination, and may ſerve in ſtead of it: I would have them here to take notice, that this is not only falſe in it ſelf, but againſt the very words of that Act whereby they are conſtituted, wherein an expreſſe proteſtation is made (as elſewhere hath been obſerved) *That they themſelves do not intend that this ſhall be taken as an Eccleſiaſticall call, but only a Civil diſpenſation of the Magiſtrates right to particular places.*

And whereas it was urged, that *The work of the Miniſtry being a work of greater conſequence and difficulty, than the work of the Magiſtrate or the Deacons, it requires greater care.*

They Anſwer, *Men may perform ſome works of greater conſequence, who yet may not perform works of leſſe conſequence. To believe is an act of higher conſequence, than to do*

the

the work of a Deacon, yet every Chriſtian may beleeve.

Reply. This is a meer fallacy, for though beleeving is a work of greater difficulty and conſequence in relation to a mans ſelf, yet not in relation to the Church and other men, and that is it we are treating of; ſo that the work of beleeving is altogether impertinent in this place, for we are ſpeaking of ſuch works as relate to others, and wherein there is a care required in relation to others, but beleeving is a work confined to a mans ſelf.

Our fourth Argument was this, *None may adminiſter the Sacraments who is uncalled; Therefore none may preach who is uncalled, for theſe two are joyned together in that Commiſſion,* Mat. 28. 19,20. *and preaching is the greater work,* 1 Cor. 1. 17.

Our Brethren make many exceptions againſt this Argument.

1. They ſay it makes againſt us, *For you* (ſay they) *ſeparate between preaching and baptizing, you allow men to preach probation-wiſe, not to adminiſter the Sacraments probation-wiſe.*

Reply. The reaſon of the difference is apparent, Preaching probation-wiſe is ſimply neceſſary in order to their Approbation and Ordination, for the trial of their gifts, and ſo this preaching is in a caſe of neceſſity, and therefore allowable; but there is no neceſſity at all of trying their gifts by adminiſtring the Sacraments, ſeeing there are none of their gifts exerciſed there, but ſuch as are fully diſcovered by their trial in preaching, *&c.*

2. They ſay, *Matth. 28. is no Commiſſion authorizing them either to preach or baptize, (that Commiſſion they had afore,* Mark 10. *&* Joh. 4.) *and therefore could not now be conſtituted afreſh.*

Reply 1. Give me leave however to propound it as my private

private opinion, though I shall not be positive in it, and I know there are some difficulties in the way, that the Apostles were indeed Officers before, but not Officers of the same kind, and therefore might well require another commission: If a man be a Captain in an Army, he is an Officer; but if he be made a Collonel, he must have a new Commission: If a man be a Deacon in a Church, he is an Officer; but if he be made a Minister, he needs a new Commission: If a man had been made a Pastour and Teacher in the Apostles daies, this man had been an Officer; but, if he had afterwards been made an Apostle, he had needed a new Commission: And this I take to be well-nigh a parallel to our case: For the Apostles it is true, were Officers before this, but I humbly conceive they were not Apostles before this; which I think will be probable by these three Considerations. 1. That an Apostle strictly so called, was a new Testament Officer, and therefore such an Office was not in being before the new Testament began: But the new Testament did not begin till the death of Christ (as all intelligent Divines grant) for that was it which rent the vail, and abolished the Jewish pedagogy. 2. They were not Apostles properly and formally, untill they had Apostollicall gifts: But these gifts they had not before the death of Christ. 3. They wanted universality of jurisdiction (which was the constant character of an Apostle) nay indeed, so far were they from having a jurisdiction over all Nations before that time, that they had not jurisdiction over all the Jews, nor (to speak strictly) over any of the Jews, for as much as they were, till Christ death, subject to the jurisdiction of the Jewish Priests, that being not taken away but by the death of Christ: And surely it is something strange to fancy them to be Apostles without any jurisdictions. I conclude therefore, they were rather Pro-

phets, or extraordinary Teachers, than Apostles, (and so Mr. *Firmin* affirms of *Paul* before *Act.* 13. *Mat.* 10.) and had not their Commission as Apostles, till *Matth.* 28. 19, 20.

2. Put case that *Mat.* 28. is not a formal Commission, yet it must needs be granted, that it is a renewing and confirming, and enlarging of their former Commission, and therein their work is afresh proposed to them, and enjoyned upon them, and that is sufficient for our purpose; for this work is double, preaching and administring the Sacraments, which being equally imposed upon them, must by like reason be equally restrained to them, unless better grounds can be shewn to the contrary, than have yet been given.

3. They say, *It is denied by some that preaching is a greater work than baptizing. The sealing of a Deed is a greater work than the writing of it, every Clerk may write it, but only the Conveyancer can seal it.*

Ans. The Question is not, whether preaching or baptizing be greater in regard of the dignity of the work? but in regard of the difficulty of it. As in the instance proposed, The sealing of the Deed is a work of greater dignity, but the writing of the Deed is a work of more difficulty, and therefore belongs to him who is appointed for such works, and who hath more skill in the management of such works: So in this case, preaching which answers to the writing of the Deed, being a work of far greater difficulty, than the applying of the seal, it was requisite that greater or at least equal care should be taken in it, and that it should be managed by none but such as are both fitted for, and appointed to the work.

The fifth Argument was this. *To usurp authority is a sin, But Preaching is an act of Authority, and therefore for persons not in Office to preach, is to usurp Authority, and so to sin.*

1 Thes. 5.

1 Thes. 5. 12. Heb. 7. *The leſſe is bleſſed of the greater: Women muſt not preach, becauſe they muſt not uſurp Authority,* 1 Tim. 2. *In Preaching the key of the kingdom of Heaven is uſed, which is an authoritative act.*

Againſt this our Brethren offer divers exceptions, ſome whereof are impertinent, and ſome frivolous: All that hath any appearance of probability, I ſhall take notice of.

1. They ſay, *Preaching is no act of Authority, for if a man preach to Heathens, where no Church is; How can he uſurp authority over the Church?*

Reply. True, he cannot uſurp authority over the Church, but authority he uſeth towards them to whom he preacheth, when *Paul* preached to Heathens, it was an authoritative act, no leſſe than when he preached to the Church: He preached as an Ambaſſadour to one as well as to the other: And ſeeing that *Paul* or any other Miniſter preaching to Heathens, or ſuch as are yet unreconciled, preacheth as in Chriſts ſtead, it can be no other than an act of authority.

2. They ſay, *There may be other rules to give authority to men to preach, beſides Ordination.*

Reply. Our Brethren ſhould do well to remember that Golden ſaying of *Ignatius*, ὁ σιγῶν κρείττων, to bring in nothing without Scripture evidence: Ordination, we know, and there are clear Scriptures warranting that, and much more clear and undoubted for that, than for Election (as hath been often obſerved) but for a Scripture warrant for another way of authorizing men to the work of the Miniſtry without Ordination, we know none, and if our Brethren know any, they ſhould do well to inform us.

3. For *Heb* 7. They ſay, *Indeed he that bleſſeth by an original, inherent power, as Chriſt doth, he is greater than*

he that is blessed, and of such a blessing the Text speaketh, but he that blesseth Ministerially, and instrumentally is not alwaies greater than he that is blessed.

Reply, This is very grosse, and contrary to the Text, which evidently speaks of *Melchizedek*, who blessed only Ministerially (and not by any original power) and yet that kind of blessing the Apostle alledgeth as an evidence of his superiority over *Abraham* as the party blessed, and if this were not spoken of *Melchizedek*, it were wholly impertinent to the present cause, which was to prove that *Melchizedek* was greater than *Abraham*.

4. They say, *There is a plain difference between teaching and usurping authority over the man, so the Text runs: But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence*, 1 Tim. 2. 12.

Reply 1. This should not have been said by such as pretend to know any thing which belongs to the interpretation of Scripture, wherein it is so familiar a thing, to use a conjunction disjunctive, or a word disjoyning one thing from another, when indeed the one explains the other: Shall any, who reads *Rev.* 22. 15. *For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers*, thence infer that these sorcerers, *&c.* are not the dogs there intended, because they are distinguished from them? This would be plainly childish. And (to give an instance in the very same kind of conjunction) *Gal.* 1. 12. speaking of the Gospel, he saith, *For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ*; where the latter is not distinct from, but expositive of the former, for how could he receive it from man, any other way then by being taught it?

2. For their phrase in this place, the Apostle hath so hem'd it in on both sides with an *exegesis*, that no rational man can doubt of it: On the one side of it teaching is forbidden;

bidden; on the other side silence is enjoyned: and nothing can be more evident, then that he speaks of that usurpation of authority which consisted in teaching, and is opposed to silence. And for what they adde, *That the Apostle speaks of her usurping authority over the man*, i. e. *her husband, not over the Church. Answer*, This is indeed to seek a knot in a bulrush: For, *the man* here is not to be understood singularly, for her husband (there is nothing in the Text which either commands or warrants such a sense) but indefinitely, for any man: For the Apostle is comparing sex with sex in the general, not husband and wife in particular: And if this Text concerns such women also as have no husbands (which I beleeve our Brethren will not deny) then the Apostle speaks of usurping authority over the male kind in the Church, not over an husband. To which may be added, that the authority here spoken of, is not an Oeconomicall, but a Politicall, an Ecclesiasticall authority; not an authority in the Family, but in the Church; not an authority assumed in some Family administration, but in a Church affair. If it be further said (for I shall improve their Argument to the highest) that the Apostles forbidding this usurping of authority to the women, allows it to the men; I Answer, It no way follows, no more then it follows, that the *French* Laws, when they prohibit women from usurping authority, or wielding the Scepter, do allow it to all men; or then it would follow, if a Law were made, that no woman should usurp authority in a corporation, that therefore every man ought to do it, which is so far from being true, that on the contrary such an act would not only forbid women also, but all others untill they were called to it.

3. To shut the door to all such cavils and unhandsome wrestings of the Text, a parallel place will put an end to

it, 1 Cor. 14. 34. *Let your women keep silence — it is not permitted for them to speak, but to be in subjection, as saith the Law*: Whence the inference is plain and undeniable, that to speak, *i. e.* in the Church, is unlawful for those who are in a state of subjection: And because all unofficed persons are in a state of subjection as well as women, therefore by the same reason they are forbidden to preach, for my part, this is so clear, that he that shall resist such evidence, I shall despair of ever seeing him convinced by man.

I shall pass over this, only taking notice of two things, which concern our present controversie.

1. That it is not only constant preaching, but even occasionall preaching which is here forbidden them: And so, by a parity of reason, gifted men unless in case of necessity, and with order to trial for Ordination, which also is necessary, as hath been argued, may not so much as preach once and their preaching though sparingly, is as clearly, though not so grossly contrary to this prohibition, as to preach constantly.

2. That it is the work, and not the manner of working, which is here forbidden: The very work of publick preaching is here forbidden them: This I say, to prevent a common evasion of our Brethren, that gifted men may not and cannot preach in the same manner as ordained persons, *i. e.* they cannot do it authoritatively, yet the work they may do: And why may not I have the same liberty, and apply it to the case of women, and say that they may do the work, although they cannot do it in the same manner, *i. e.* with authority: If I should say so, it would be easie to silence me, by saying, that the very act of preaching is spoken of, as an act of authority, and that may justly silence them too.

The sixth Argument was this, *The Scripture reproves*

unealled

uncalled men for preaching. Jer. 23. 21, 22. *They are reproved not onely for preaching false doctrine, but for preaching without a call, for running without being sent.*

To this our Brethren return this strange Answer; *That these were Prophets rightly called by God; and they are blamed for this that being Prophets they did not prophesie right things* pag. 128.

Reply. This is a little too grosse, to say, they are by God called to be Prophets, of whom God professeth, *They ran but he sent them not*: Whether shall we believe God or our Brethren? And this is the more considerable, because it was not with Prophets as it is with ordinary Gospel-Ministers (who besides the delivery of a message to them from God, must also have a solemn mission and authorization for the work) for the Prophets had no other call then this, or at lest, this was Gods usuall way of calling them, he immediately inspired them with an extraordinary message: And when God vouchsafed to send such a message, that was taken for an authorization of them, or a call to be a Prophet, as plainly appears in the case of *Samuel*, 1 *Sam.* 3. where after God had delivered a message to, and by *Samuel*, it followes, v. 20. *And all Israel knew that Samuel was established to be a Prophet of the Lord*: And therefore on the contrary seeing these Prophets were such as had not any message at all from God that we read of) thereby it is evident that they were not Prophets, and he that saith, they were such, as he asserts it *gratis*, so it is plaine, it is but an opinion taken up [illegible] to gratify their cause. And I am perswaded had not our Brethren been hurried into this fancy by the favourable aspect it hath to their doctrine, they would have rejected it as wholly ridiculous. Whereas they urge that saying, *If they had stood in my counsell, and had caused my people to hear my words, then they should have turned them*

them from their evil way, but the Lord would not have entailed his blessing upon the labours of false Prophets. I answer. 1. As the words are here rendred, they no way oppose our doctrine, for, The standing in Gods Counsell, and speaking Gods Words, implies a call, as hath been shewed; as if he had said If they had waited till I had sent them, and delivered my message to them, then they might have expected a blessing. 2. It must be observed that there is another reading proposed by some learned men, which as it is very conformable to the Hebrew Text, so it is more probable in it self, and more consonant to the context, to read it thus, *If they had stood in my counsel*, i. e. *if they had stood till I had sent them*, &c. *they would have profited this people and they would have turned them from their evil way*; whereas now they did encourage them in it; so that he brings in this as an evidence, that they were false Prophets.

The seventh Argument used by the Provinciall Assembly was this: *The Ministers of Christ have been as carefull to make proof of their mission as of their doctrine*, Gal. 1. Joh. 3. 27, 28. Luk. 20. 2.

To this they say: 1. *If it prove a call, yet it proves not that this call is ordination.*

Ans. That is not the businesse, to speak of this or that particular call, (that is proved in another proposition) but onely in the generall to shew, that over and besides gifts, some other call, mission, or designation from God, either immediate, or mediate, is required, and this is sufficient against our Brethren, who assert, that any man having gifts, is *eo nomine*, called by God to preach, and his gifts alone sufficiently warrant him, though he have no other call.

2. They say, *The reason why Paul proves his mission, was but for his doctrines sake, and although it was necessary for*

Paul

Paul to prove his immediate call; and to prove the divineneſſe of the doctrines of the Goſpel, yet there is no ſuch reaſon to make it neceſſary to prove a mediate call.

Reply. 1. I do not underſtand that the proof of *Pauls* extraordinary miſſion was neceſſary to prove the divineneſs of his doctrine, for then, thoſe ordinary officers that preached in that time could not have proved the divineneſſe of their doctrine. Beſides, there are, and were diverſe other excellent and ſufficient mediums to prove his doctrine by, he proved it out of the Law and the Prophets, by miracles, by ocular witneſſes of Chriſts reſurrection, *&c.*

It is true he proves his miſſion for his doctrines ſake, and that makes not againſt us at all, but for us, ſeeing if *Paul* had preached without a call, he had given juſt occaſion to ſuſpect his doctrine and to doubt of the certainty of it, (becauſe they that reject Gods warrant to the office, have no reaſon to promiſe to themſelves Gods bleſſin the work) And therefore it followes ſtrongly, that much more ought Miniſters, who have far leſſe gifts then *Paul* had, to prove their miſſion and call, or elſe they muſt give men leave to doubt of the certainty of their doctrine. It is true (what our Brethren ſay) that, *the proofe of an ordinary call is no ſufficient argument to prove the truth of the doctrine, ſeeing ordinary lawfull Miniſters may erre:* But yet when a man cannot prove his call, that may render his doctrine doubtfull, and the reaſon is, becauſe, *Bonum oritur ex integris, malum ex quolibet defectu.*

To make a mans preaching regular many things muſt concurre, he muſt be called, he muſt preach agreeable to the Word, *&c.* But the want of any one of theſe will make it irregular.

Other things they ſay, but becauſe they are triviall, I wave them, as not having ſuch ſtore of

time as to throw it away to no purpose.

The eighth and last Argument was this. *That work may not be performed which cannot be performed in faith: But preaching by a gifted Brother, not called, &c. cannot be done in faith; for, 1. Such have no precept to preach. 2. There is no precept for people to hear them or maintaine them. 3. They have no promise of assistance, of protection, of successe, &c.*

To which our Brethren say something: But because they adde nothing of any weight, except that which hath been said by themselves before, and by us answered; to avoid Tautologies, I shall ease my self, and Reader, of the trouble of following them: There is one thing onely which is very observable, that they say nothing as to that which is most considerable in the argument, which is the matter of maintenance; which I must desire them seriously, and conscientiously to peruse, and let them take it in this form, and give me leave to improve it.

All Scripture-Preachers may challenge maintenance: But all gifted men (though preaching) cannot challenge maintenance, Therefore they are no Scripture-Preachers.

The Major is the maine thing liable to doubt, and therefore I shall prove it. Either all Scripture-Preachers may challenge maintenance, or onely such Preachers as are in office-relation to those to whom they preach, and of whom they challenge maintenance: But not onely such Preachers may challenge maintenance as are in office-relation to them; Therefore all Scripture-Preachers may challenge this maintenance.

The Minor (for that onely is liable to exception) I prove thus: The Apostles (say our Brethren) were onely in office-relation to the Church, and other Teachers are onely in office-relation to their particular Churches (as they assert) But these might challenge maintenance from others.

The

The disciples *Luke* 10. had no office-relation to them to whom they preached, they were no officers in the Jewish Church, and the Christian Church was not then erected, and yet for their very work they may require maintenance. *v. 7. And in the same house remaine eating and drinking such things as they give, for the labourer is worthy of his hire.*

And *Paul*, where ever he sowes spirituals (though it be among heathens) he may require carnals, 1 *Cor.* 9. And generally in Scripture, the maintenance is rather thrown upon the work then upon the office. The double honour, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. and the high estimation, 1 *Thes.* 5. 13. is for their works sake. And the oxe that treadeth out the corn (though it may be he treadeth not out his own Masters but another mans corn) ought not to be muzled: I would desire our brethren to answer me this question: Suppose a man will go into *Wales* to preach the Gospel, Whether in that case, they do not believe the people are obliged to give him carnalls for his spiritualls? If they affirme it (as I believe they have too much ingenuity to deny it, and the foregoing places fully evince it) then we have gained thus much, that the maintenance is not due onely to such as are office-wise related to those to whom they preach, but to all Scripture-Preachers, which was the thing to be proved, and so we have secured the Major.

For the Minor, it is needless to spend time about it, for our brethren grant it, and besides it speakes for it self: For if all gifted men be bound to preach (as our brethren assert) and if in Churches, many men are, and all ought to covet to be so gifted (which also they assert) then the maintenance of such would be both absurd and impossible.

And thus much shal suffice for the vindication of the Pro-

vinciall Assemblies Arguments, to prove that none ought to Preach without Ordination: And so I have done with the principall Question: Onely that the Reader may be able more judiciously to compare things together I shall present him with an ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, or enumeration of the Arguments on both sides.

The Arguments alledged by them to prove that unordained men may preach.

I am the more willing to propound all their Arguments together, because I would not take them at advantage, but set the best glosse upon their cause, for, it oft-times falls out, that, *quæ non prosunt singula, juncta juvant*, those Arguments which when they are pull'd asunder, have but little strength in them, being united together, seem considerable; so that if their cause have any reall strength in it, we shall see it here, when the arrowes are all put together in one bundle, or else we may conclude, that there is neither strength nor truth in it.

Their first Argument is this. Election must go before Ordination (which they take for granted, though it never was proved) But a person must Preach before Election and therefore before Ordination, and so one not yet Ordained may Preach: So that their Argument is this: Because a man unordained may Preach in a case of necessity, *i. e.* when he is to be tried for Election or Ordination, therefore he may Preach where there is no necessity.

Arg. 2. Gifted men unordained are commanded to Preach. And here because *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 4. 9, 10, 11. commands every man to exercise his gift they inferre from thence, that this gift must needs include preaching (though it may as well relate to hospitality) and that this gift must needs be exercised in a publick way, by such as have no further call thereunto.

Arg.

Arg. 3. They argue from examples, Because *Apollos* (who was a man extraordinarily indowed, and an Officer 1 *Cor.* 1. 12.) spake publickly to divers *Jews*, though not gathered together in a Church assembly; and because the scattered Saints (who it is doubtful whether they were officers or no) in a case of persecution and necessity spake occasionally of the things of God to persons they met with, therefore any gifted men may ordinarily, and without a case of necessity preach publickly in a Church Assembly.

Arg. 4. Because some persons, who are called by the name of Officers, Prophets, and therefore may well be concluded to be in Office, because such being inriched with extraordinary gifts did Prophesie, therefore persons who are unquestionably no Officers, and whose gifts are but ordinary, may preach.

And this is *bonâ fide* the whole strength of their opinion, which, whether it be of sufficient force to transport a man beyond the sentiment or judgement of the Church, in all ages, of the generality of the reformed Churches of the present ages, of the far greater part of learned and godly divines among us: I desire our brethren, and all that are concerned in it, in the fear of God to consider.

And now let us see whether we cannot give a better account of our assertion, and whether it doth not stand upon a firmer basis.

The Arguments alledged by us, to prove that unordained men may not Preach.

Arg. 1. None may Preach lawfully, unless (besides their gifts) they have a mission from God, *Rom.* 10.

Arg. 2. Neither *Aaron*, no nor the Lord Jesus would undertake their offices, nor do any work of their offices, untill, over and above their excellent gifts, they had received

ceived from God a call and deſignation thereunto. And therefore perſons farre inferiour in excellency and gifts ought not upon the account of their gifts, either undertake any office, or any work of any office, without a further call thereunto; nor are they by 1 *Pet.* 4. or any other place obliged to it.

Arg. 3. Goſpel-Preachers are called by names importing an office: Embaſſadors, Stewards, *&c.* And therefore ſuch Preachers are onely officers, for names muſt anſwer to things.

Arg. 4. Gifts and calling, are conſtantly diſtinguiſhed.

5. Diverſe rules are laid down to guide and caution men in the admiſſion of perſons to the office of Preaching the Goſpel, all which, are ſuperfluous, if gifted men are, *ex nomine*, warranted to Preach.

6. To allow the Preaching of unordained men, opens a door to all confuſion.

7. God hath puniſhed ſuch as (though ſufficiently gifted and qualified for the work they did) undertook to do a work, to which they were not called, as *Uzzah*, *Saul*, *Uzziah*.

8. None may performe any religious ſervice to God, but ſuch as are appointed, or otherwiſe warranted thereunto: But all gifted men are not appointed to preach, for then they ſinne if they neglect it, *&c.*

9. None may do the work of a Magiſtrate or a Deacon, who is not called to it, and therefore none may, without a call, do the work of a Miniſter, which is a work of far greater difficulty and more importance.

10. None may adminiſter the Sacraments, becauſe he is gifted, unleſſe withall he be ſolemnly ſet apart for the work. *Ergo* none but ſuch an one may preach, for as much as God hath joyned both theſe together.

11. Preach-

11. Preaching is an act of authority, and therefore must not be done by such as are under authority, by such as are not officers.

12. Scripture reproves uncalled men for Preaching.

13. Christs Ministers have been alwayes carefull to prove their Calling as well as their Doctrine.

14. Gifted men uncalled cannot Preach in Faith, neither are they commanded to Preach, nor People to hear them, *&c.*

15. All Scripture-Preachers may challenge maintenance, But all Gifted men, though Preaching, cannot challenge maintenance: Therefore they are not Scripture-Preachers.

The Tenth Chapter concerns Doctor Collings, *and is by him answered.*

CHAP. XI.

THus we have dispatched our main work, now it onely remains that somewhat be spoken as to the businesse of Election and Ordination; and here a threefold question should be ventilated.

1. Whether Election by divine right belong to the people.

2. Whether the essence of the Ministerial call consists in Election or Ordination.

3. Whether Ordination may be done by the people.

For the First, Whether Election by divine right belong to the people, there is no need to say any thing about it, because it hath been so fully ventilated by others; only for those three places alledged in favour of this Election, and

and answered by the Provincial Assembly, which they have here undertaken to vindicate, it will be convenient to say something, as also of the absurdities objected by the Assembly to the Affirmative.

The first place is *Acts* 1. 23. It was answered:

1. These words, *they appointed two*, do in all probability relate to the Apostles, *v.* 5, 17, 21, 22. To this our Brethren reply, *The exhortation about chusing was given to the* 120 *brethren and therefore they did chuse.*

Reply. It was not an exhortation to chuse, nor a direction in chusing (here is not a word of the knowledge, piety, prudence, *&c.* of the person to be chosen, which useth to be the subject of the Apostles discourse, when he exhorts to, or directs in chusing) but onely a declaration that one must be chosen, which was very congruous and convenient, whether the Apostles or people did appoint; and however the Apostles might and did appoint, yet it was fit the People should consent and be satisfied.

I forbear other things as to this place, because they will recur in the next place, whither I refer them; only this I leave to the consideration of ingenuous men, that it is at least doubtful who it was that are here said to appoint two; the Grammatical construction and Logical connexion possibly will bear either; I am sure it will bear the Apostles, and therefore great stresse cannot be laid upon this place.

The next alledged Text is that, *Acts* 6. 3. concerning the choice of Deacons.

To which it was said, *That the people were guided and limited in their choice by the Apostles; so that if they had swerved from the Apostles directions, the Apostles would not have ordained them.*

To this they Answer, *That Lawes and Rules directing in the choice, hinders not the entireness of the choice: A Corporation*

gration have entire power of chusing and yet are limited by Lawes.

Reply. It is true, Regulation by dead Lawes and Rules is no prejudice to the peoples sole power in election, but a regulation by living Judges doth destroy it, to wit, the regulation being such, as here is is, wherein the Apostles (or their vicegerents the Ministers) have not only a bare vote in the election, but a negative voice, whereby it is in their power either to chuse or refuse: So it was here, and therefore surely the Apostles had a share, yea, the great share in the choice, and therefore the people had not the whole and sole power in the choosing of Deacons, which was to be proved. This case is not unlike our Colledges, where the Fellows have a power to chuse, &c. yet under the direction and regulation of the Master, who hath a power to chuse or refuse the person chosen by the Fellows. Can any sober man in this case say that the sole power of choosing is in the Fellowes? Is it not in the Master also? And so it was in the Apostles.

3. Our Brethren forget the maine thing that was driven at, which by their own acknowledgement was this, that The essence of the call consists not in Election, and that plainly appeares from this place: For if the Apostles had refused any of those chosen by the people upon just grounds, I desire our Brethren to Answer whether they think they would have been Deacons notwithstanding, whether the Apostles would or nor. If they say, *yea*, that is so injurious to the Apostles, and their jurisdiction, that they will have few followers; if they say *no*, then the essence of the call to the office of the Deacon (and so of the Ministes by their own Argument) consists not in Election, unlesse they will say, that a man can be a Deacon and yet want the essence of a Deacon.

Excep. *If this Election had been frustraneous it had not*

been for want of Ordination, or for the neglect of observation of Gospel-Rules in chusing.

Anſ. Nay, on the contrary, it had been the want of Ordination. For suppose the people had proceeded according to Gospel-Rules, in the Election and choosing a person visibly fit, and the Apostles by the spirit of discerning, seeing something in him which renders him unfit, had denied Ordination; In this case, the Election had been null, though according to Rule. *Ergo*, The want of Ordination makes it null, efficiently, or rather deficiently, though the want of fit qualification makes it null meritoriously.

And againe, let us suppose that both the people and the Apostles had not exactly kept to the Rule in choosing (for the Apostles might erre in matters of fact though not in matters of doctrine) and the people had chosen, and the Apostles ordained a man not fit for the office according to rule, in that case, to say that this call had been null, would be a venturous assertion. It is harsh to say, of every man chosen to the office of a Deacon who is not full of the holy Ghost and wisdome, (for those are the required qualifications) that his choice is null. I am confident our brethren have too much modesty to affirme it, and if they do not affirme it, then that which in this case had made the election null, had not been the not observing of Gospel-Rules, but the want of Ordination.

2. It was said, that, *though the people might have the sole power of chusing Deacons, yet not of Ministers.* A minore ad majus non valet argumentum affirmativè.

To this they Answer, *That we use that kind of arguing, when we argue thus; We use Ordination in the choice of Deacons*; Ergo, *of Ministers much more, so Christ argues from the lesse to the greater; God takes care of Lillies, Ravens*, &c. Ergo, *he will much more take care of you.* Mat. 6.

Reply. Our Brethrens answer runs upon a grosse mistake, for

for they inconsiderately confound two Canons which vastly differ (though both of them belong to the same Topick.)

1. Their Argument is fetcht from this Canon: *Cui competit minus, competit majus*: If a power of choosing Deacons, which is the lesse, belongs to the people, then a power of choosing Ministers, which is the greater, belongs to them.

To this the Assembly well answered: *A minori ad majus, non valet affirmativè.* It is very false to argue thus: The power of choosing a Captaine belongs to the Colonel, *Ergo*, the power of chusing a Generall belongs to him: Or thus, The members of such a Company have a power to chuse their own Officers (which is the lesse) and therefore they have a power to chuse the City Officers, which is the greater. It is a true Rule, *A majori ad minus, valet affirmativè, i. e. Cui competit majus, competit minus*: But it is false to argue, *A minori ad majus affirmativè*, or thus, *Cui competit minus, competit majus.*

2. But there is another Canon, much differing from the former, and that is this, *Quod competit minori, competit etiam majori*: If Ordination was required to the meaner and lesse considerable Office, which is that of the Deacons, much more is it required to that which is the greater and weightier Office. And this was the Argument used by the Assembly. And to this belongs the Argument, *Mat.* 6. 26. If the care of Gods Providence reacheth to lillies (which are the lesse) much more will it reach to you, which are the greater.

The third Text alledged for the peoples election, was *Act.* 14. 23. *When they had created them elders by suffrages*, (for so they say the word, χειροτονήσαντες, is generally used) *in every City: And this they say, may have reference to the*

disciples, as well as to Paul and Barnabas, for they were spoken of before.

Reply. One would think nothing more can be said, or desired by any sober man for the elucidation and vindication of this Text, then the making out of these two things,

1. That the word χειροτονεω is frequently used for a simple chusing or appointing, though without suffrages,

2. That it cannot be taken here for chusing by suffrages.

From these two, it followes most evidently, and irrefragably, that this place, (which is alledged as a pillar to prove the peoples election, &c.) doth no wayes inforce it, but rather overthrow it.

For the first, that the word χειροτονια & χειροτονεω, are not alwayes used for a chusing by suffrages, but oft times, for a simple chusing, or appointing, &c. is most plaine, from *Acts* 10. 41. and may be made good by a multitude of instances, for which the Provincial Assembly, referred you to other Authors, and especially *Selden de Synedriis*, it being needlesse to transcribe.

2. How oft the use of words varies from the etymologie, no man can be ignorant, that is not wholly a stranger to the Greek tongue.

But our Brethren say, it is strange, that *Luke* should use the word in such a sense as was different from the custome of all that writ before him.

I answer. 1. It is so used by others, as was now said.

2. It is no new thing, to find a word, used in Scripture in a different sense, from that which it hath in other Authors. And if our Brethren acknowledge that *Luke* useth the word, προχειροτονεω, *Acts* 10. 41. in a sense, never used in any Author before him; Why may we not expect the same favour for χειροτονησαντες?

2. Al-

2. Although this (if nothing else could be said) were sufficient to answer their Argument, which is taken from the word χειροτονήσαντες, and it be incumbent upon them to shew, that the word must needs be so understood in this place, yet, *ex abundanti*, we assert, That this word cannot be taken in their sense: And in this case by their own allowance, we may recede, from the native signification of the word, because it is repugnant to the context.

And for proof of this, I shall but desire any candid Reader, diligently to read the whole context, especially in the Greek tongue, And I perswade my self, he will judge it but a few removes from an impossibility to understand it in our Brethrens sense.

1. They are said to ordaine to them, αὐτοῖς, not to themselves, ἑαυτοῖς, as it should have been, if the people had done it. And although it be true, that αὐτοῖς, is sometimes taken for ἑαυτοῖς, yet that is but seldome (and then also it is, for the most part, aspirated, ἑαυτοῖς) and the common use of the word, (by which our Brethren will have us guided in the word χειροτονήσαντες, and therefore we expect the like from them in the word αὐτοῖς) I say, the common use of the word is otherwise, and especially this is considerable, if you take notice of other circumstances, which oblige us to this sense, as namely:

2. The same persons are said to ordaine in severall Cities and Churches: Therefore it must needs be meant of them that had an authority over severall Churches.

3. They ordained, *&c.* who going away, commended the people to the Lord, and surely that was the Apostles: it is a lamentable shift to say, *That the disciples are spoken of in the foregoing verse, and therefore it may be understood of them.* True, they are spoken of and so are the Apostles spoken of, and, seeing both are spoken of, we must in-

quire, to whom this must be referred, and for that, the very first rudiments of Grammer will determine, that the reference must be to words of the same case. Now then, in the 22. verse, the disciples are spoken of in the *Accusative* case, and as passive under the Apostles confirming, τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μαθητῶν and ἐμὲ, with which χειροτονήσαντες, by no meanes agrees, as being active, and of the *Nominative* case: But now if you understand it of the Apostles, all things run handsomly. The same persons are brought in as ἐναγγελισάμενοι, vers. 21. ἐπιστρέφοντες, v. 22. χειροτονήσαντες, v. 23. παρέθεντο, v. 24. λαλήσαντες, v. 25. *&c.* all of them of the *Nominative* case, and the active signification. And whoever take out the word χειροτονήσαντες, from all the rest, wherewith it is hedged in on both sides, as they offer manifest violence to the Text, so they will be judged by indifferent persons, meerly to take it up in favour of a preconceived opinion.

And therefore our Brethren, do well take up, and at last come to this faint conclusion; *Though this doe referre to the Apostles, yet the people may be comprehended in it*: So that whereas in the first canvasing of this Text, we had much adoe to get in the Apostles, and this Text hath been often alledged by our Brethren to shew, not that the people may, but that the people must, ordaine and chuse themselves Elders, now all that it amounts to, is a *may be*, they may be included here. All the answer it deserves, and that I shall give is this; The people may not be included here: At least *non liquet*, it appears not from the Text at all, that they are comprehended here. However, let the question lie here, between us and our Brethren, whether this Text, and this Ordaining belong to the Apostles (who are here expressly said to do it) or to the people (of whose χειροτονία, not a word is spoken here) and I suppose impartiall Arbitrators will quickly end the difference.

But

But, (say they, who ever did χειροτονεῖν yet) *this* χειροτονία *cannot be meant of Ordination, seeing it is mentioned as distinct from Ordaining by prayer and fasting, when they had chosen — and had prayed with fasting, and if Ordination were intended, here were a Tautologie.*

Reply. I would ask our Brethren this question, whether in case the people were they who are here said χειροτονῆσαι, to chuse Elders, whether they did not manage that work with prayer and fasting, and whether this Text doth not sufficiently speak for it self, that this prayer and fasting was used in relation to the choice of Officers: If they assent, then the Tautologie remaines on their part as well as on ours.

2. But indeed, we must take heed of calling it a Tautologie, when ever we find the same thing expressed in divers phrases, which is a familiar practice in Scripture.

3. Albeit the word χειροτονῆσαι, when put by it self, did signify, to ordaine by fasting, and prayer, and laying on of hands, yet common reason and frequent use will teach us, that when fasting and prayer are expressed, then χειροτονῆσαι should be understood onely of imposing of hands.

4. Our Brethren forget the present work, we did not alledge this place, or this word, to prove that Ordination is to be done by fasting, prayer, and laying on of hands, nor were we drawing any argument from this Text, But we were upon the defensive part, and our work was onely this to maintaine, that χειροτονῆσαι doth not here signify a creating by the suffrages of the people, which being proved, our Brethrens attempt from this Text is frustrated, and the place sufficiently vindicated.

These three places being cleared, and redeemed from misinterpretation, there is but one thing remains to be done, which is a little to inforce those absurdities objected by the

Provincial

Provinciall Assembly against their opinion. I shall take notice onely of the first, as being most materiall, which is this:

Every one that is to be made a Minister, must first be tried, 1 Tim. 3, 10. *whether he be apt to teach, able to convince gaine sayers. Now in many Congregations, the major part are very unfit to judge of Ministeriall abilities.*

To this they answer: *That true Churches are fit to judge of Ministeriall abilities, Christs sheep know his voice,* John 10. *and the Church could judge of the qualifications of Bereans,* Act. 6.

Reply. 1. I dare venture the question upon this point, and although I shall not determine it concerning every congregation (whereof possibly some learned men may be members by accident) yet, for the generality of Congregations (including such as are constituted according to our brethrens principles) I say they are not able to judge of a mans soundnesse in the faith, and his ability to convince gaine sayers. I will onely suppose that (which generally is true) a Congregation to consist of such, as are unacquainted with the affaires of learning, and I will suppose a crafty heretick to come before them, I say, he may most easily conceale his heresies, so that they shall never discover it, nor be able to try his soundnesse in the faith. I might instance in divers cases, suppose a Socinian is to be tried by the people, they ask him whether he believe Christ to be God, he will Answer *yes*, I believe him to be the true God, to be one with the Father, to be equall with God. How apt would a company of honest soules be to be cheated with such pretences? and how readily would they be his comporgators, witnesses, if this man were to be called by Ministers, they know that these are but words, and that though he acknowledge Christ in word, yet in

deed

deed he denies him, and allowes him to be God, onely as the Magistrate is a God; so there are many other weighty points, wherein it is impossible for the people to try a mans soundnesse in the faith. How many grosse errors are there about the providence of God, the Person and Natures of Christ, the fall of man; which any learned man may so hide under ambiguous expressions, that it shall be impossible for an ordinary Congregation to discover them, unlesse they plow with the heifer of Ministers or Scholars: So for a mans ability to defend the truth, and convince gain-sayers, how unfit people are to judge of that. no man can be ignorant, that considers how sadly, and frequently, the judgements of people of all sorts, and opinions, and waies, are misplaced, applauding some highly for their sufficiency that way, who are known to understanding men, to be miserably defective therein, and vilifying others, who are unquestionably far more sufficient. To convince gain-sayers, is a great part of learning, and that unlearned men should be able to judge of a mans learning, will then be believed, when it will be credited, that a blind man can judge of colours, or, a deaf man of sounds, or an ordinary ignorant man, of the great affaires of State.

2. For that in *John*, I hope our Brethren will be ashamed to alledge it to this purpose, when they shall consider that it is a character given by Christ to all his sheep, *My sheep know my voice.* It is true of wise men and weak men, of men, women, and children, which are the sheep of Christ: So that, unlesse they will say, that the silliest woman in a Congregation, who is godly, is able to judge of a Ministers ability to convince gain-sayers, (then which nothing can be more highly absurd) they must confesse this Text was impertinently alledged.

3. For the peoples fitnesse to judge of the Deacons

abilities it is a strange instance, that because people are able to judge of a mans prudence, faithfullnesse, piety, &c. therefore they are able to judge of his learning, and sufficiency. And you may as well argue thus, that such a man is able to build an house well, therefore he can mold a State.

And thus much shall suffice, to speak of the first Question, which, when a judicious, and candid Reader, hath duely weighed, I may groundedly hope, that he will be thus far convinced, that the necessity of Popular Election is not so clear, as hath been conceived, nor indeed so manifest, as Ordination. And sure I am, if we had no better evidences for Ordination, then such as these, we should have sufficiently heard of it from our Brethren.

CHAP. XII.

THE second Question is this: Whether the Essence of the Call to the Ministry, lie in Election or Ordination. And here also I must take the same liberty I have used, and that is not to transcribe every word nor to take notice of such passages as are inconsiderable, but onely such as have most strength, and most appearance of truth in them. In the doing of which, as I have the witnesse of God, and my own conscience, so I doubt not I shall have the attestation of any disinterested person, who shall compare both together.

But, before I come to handle the point, I must needs do my Brethren that right, as to let the world know, how far they are from that generation of men that despise and deride Ordination, they say, *we do highly esteem of Ordi-*

nation

nation at the appointment of Jesus Christ, p. 275. Onely here they differ, They give Election the precedency to Ordination, and they place the essence of the Ministeriall call in Election, not in Ordination. But good reason, we should not condemn them unheard: I shall therefore do them the justice as to consider what they offer by way of Argument, and that is onely this: Ordination doth not give the essence; *Ergo*, election doth (for their first Argument from *Acts* 14. *vers.* 23. hath been discussed before.) That the essence of the Call lies not in Ordination, they indeavour to make good by three Arguments.

Their first Argument is this, *That which doth not set a man over a Church of Christ, or commit it to his charge, that doth not give the essentials of the Ministeriall office: But Ordination doth not set a man over a Church of Christ*, &c. *because without Election a man cannot be over any flock.*

I answer to the Minor, and the proofe. 1. That it is but a begging of the question, and hath been before disproved, that without Election a man cannot be over any flock.

2. Although a man could not be over a flock without Election, and Election were necessary to his Call, yet the Essence of the Call may lie in Ordination. Election may be necessary, as the *causa sine qua non*, and yet Ordination may be the *causa formalis* of the Call to the Ministry. Suppose by some ancient Charter, the People of such a City, are invested with a right to chuse their own Minister. So that without their Election, he is not their Minister. Yet so, as that it belongs to some Gentleman, to present the person so Elected, unlesse he can shew reason to refuse him, in this case Election is necessary, and yet the Essence of the civil Call, lies in his Presentation. Or

[illegible] Canterbury, had been to [illegible] Canterbury, yet, notwithstanding the [illegible] of their Election, the Essence of the Arch Bishops Call did lie in another thing, to wit, civilly in the gift of the King, Ecclesiastically, in his consecration by the Bishops: So, though the Election of the people were necessary, yet the Essence of the Call, may lie in the Ordination of the Minister.

3. Although Election determine a mans imployment to this or that particular place, yet Ordination sets him over a Church of Christ, *viz.* over the whole Church: His Ordination sets him over a Church indefinitely; his Election sets him over this or that particular Church. As the Act of the University, makes a man a Doctor of Physick, but the choice of such a City, or such a noble Family, makes him the Physitian of that City, or Family.

The second Argument is this: *Ordination is to be consequentiall unto a mans having the whole Essence of the Call to the office, Acts 13. 3. Paul and Barnabas had the Essence of their Call before from God, they were not of men, Gal. 1. And this example is a binding rule to us.*

Answ. 1. I might say, as Divines say of Vocation, That there is a Calling, *ad fœdus*, to the Covenant, and *ad munus*, to an Office. So likewise for Ordination, there is a double Ordination, the one *ad munus*, to an Office, the other, *ad opus*, to a Work. The Ordination which we spake of, and wherein the Essence of the Ministeriall Call doth consist, is an Ordination to an Office; and such an Ordination the Apostle never had, *Gal.* 1. 1. And such an Ordination, this Text, peradventure, speaks not of, but of an Ordination to a Work, nor is there any ground to wonder, that men should be solemnly Ordained to such a work as this, a work so great, so uncouth, so difficult, so much

much exposed to contradiction, nor was it unusuall in the Church either of the Old or New Testament, to use fasting and prayer, or laying of hands, as well in the designation of a person to a work, as to an Office.

2. This Argument will fall as heavy upon Election as Ordination: It must be remembred that they assert that the essence of the call lies in Election, and to prove this, they urge the Election of an Apostle, *Acts* 1. Now from hence, I thus argue against them: If this was the prerogative of the Apostles, that they had their call neither of man nor by man, *&c.* then the essence of their call doth not lie in Election: But this was the prerogative of Apostles, that they were neither of men nor by men; so that although Ordination and Election were both used in reference to the Apostles, yet the essence of the call did lie in neither of them: And it is certain that in *Acts* 1. the essence of *Matthias* his call, did not lie in the election of the people (for that *Barsabas* had, as well as *Matthias*) but in the designation of God: And therefore, as our Brethren would say for themselves, in that case, that we are to distinguish between what is ordinary and what is extraordinary, between what was peculiar to the Apostles, and what was common to other Officers; and that this was common to the Apostles, with other Officers to be admitted by Election, which therefore is a president for us in the call of other Officers, but that the essence of their call should not lie in Election, but in Gods designation, this was peculiar to them, and so is no rule to us; the same Liberty, I hope they will allow us, to say, that in this Ordination here was, 1. Something ordinary and common to the Apostles, with other Officers, which was to be ordained, which therefore doth strongly justifie the use and necessity of Ordination to other Officers, 2. Something extraordi-

nary and peculiar, to wit, that the essence of their call did not lie in this Ordination, but in the immediate appointment of God, which therefore cannot be applied to ordinary Officers.

To say nothing of that which peradventure may be said, that *Paul* had the essence of his Call from this Ordination, and yet no prejudice to that other assertion that *Paul* had his Office neither of nor by man, *Gal.* 1. for though men were used as instruments in the dispensation of the rites belonging to *Pauls* Ordination, yet to speak properly it was not men but God, that was *Pauls* Ordainer, for the holy Ghost said, *separate me*, &c. It was not men that nominated *Paul* to be an Officer, but God did it from heaven.

Their third Argument is taken from the nature of Ordination, *Ordination* (say they) *is nothing else but the solemn separation of an Officer by prayer and fasting* (they after adde, *and laying on of hands*) *to the work whereunto he is called: It can be imagined to consist but of three things. 1. Fasting, and that is no act of worship. 2. Laying on of hands, and that was not essentiall to Ordination then, and it is questionable, whether it be still continuing or not. 3. Prayer, which therefore must be the act giving essence to Ordination seeing the others do not.*

Now upon all this, they build a double argument.

1. *Ordination consisteth in an action performed to God only, i. e. in prayer, therefore it cannot give the Essence of an externall call to office, from men.*

2. *That action which cannot be performed in faith, before a man have his outward Call to office, cannot give him that outward call: But Ordination is such an action, &c. For how can a man pray in faith, for his blessing upon a person in a work of an office, before he can conclude, that he is so much as outwardly called to that office.*

For

For Answer. 1. For the last clause, I also would ask our Brethren one question; Suppose the Essence of the Ministeriall Call did consist in Election, and that Prayers are to be used for the person to be Elected, before his Election (which I know our Brethren will not dislike) in this case I ask them their own question. How can they pray in faith for a blessing upon that person in the work of his Office, before he have the Call to the Office? Whatsoever they shall reply with reason, will serve for our use as well as theirs.

2. In such cases, our prayers have (as most frequently in many other cases) a tacit condition, that God would blesse him in the work, *viz.* if he shall be set apart for it. I may pray in faith, that God would go with me in a journey, that God would blesse me in the exercises of the Lords day, *&c.* Although I do not certainly know that I shall live either to go one step in my journey, or to do one exercise upon the Lords day.

3. All their Argument proceeds upon a grosse mistake and unacquaintednesse with our principles: In a word, we hold that the Essence of Ordination, consists in none of those three things mentioned, neither in fasting, nor prayer, nor laying on of hands, (all which are only the modifications of the work) but in something else, to wit, in this, the designation of fit persons by Officers unto the work, which designation indeed, is signified by imposition of hands, and deservedly introduced, with fasting and prayer, as being a work of greatest weight, yet still the Essence of it lies not in this.

4. For imposition of hands, it is granted by most Presbyterians, that I know of, that it is not so Essentiall to Ordination, as that they will pronounce that Ordination null, which wanted it, although they conceive, it being a rite instituted by Christ, cannot without sinne, be neglected

lected by men. Whether imposition of hands ought to continue in the Church, is excentricall to our present question, and therefore I shall wave it, leaving onely this *Memorandum* for the Readers consideration.

That the great Argument used for the abolition of it, because it was used in those daies for the collation of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, hath to me, very little cogency in it; both because by the same reason, Preaching must be now laid aside, because when *Peter* preached, the holy Ghost fell upon them that heard him, *Acts* 10.44. And because it continued all along in the old Testament, notwithstanding this, that sometimes it was used in those times for the collation of extraordinary gifts, as *Deut.* 34.9. *And Joshua was full of the spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands upon him.* But I must recall my self, and remember that it is not now my task to meddle with that point, but only to shew that our Brethrens Arguments are not unanswerable.

And now that we have seen the weaknesse of their Arguments alledged to prove that the essence of the Ministerial call consisteth in Election, not in Ordination, I shall consider whether we cannot find stronger Arguments to prove the contrary, That the essence of the call doth not lie in the Election of the people, but in the Ordination of the Ministers.

CHAP. XIII.

I Shall confine my self to one Argument, which I shall desire our Brethren to chew upon, which is this.

The essence of the call to the Ministry, must lie in the act of those only, who by divine appointment are and ought

ought to be in a capacity to give it: But the people neither are, nor by divine appointment are neceſſarily required to be in capacity to give the eſſence of the call to the Miniſtry: *Ergo*, The eſſence of the call doth not lie in the act of the people, *i. e.* not in Election.

For the *Major*, it is a plain caſe: Wherever God puts a man upon a work, he requires that he be fit for it. God will have no man to undertake any work, of Magiſtracy, Miniſtry, *&c.* for which he is not fit. The Teacher muſt be apt to teach, *&c.* And if it be one of the works of a Miniſter to ſend forth other Miniſters, then God requires this of him, that he be in a capacity to do it. And ſo doubtleſſe, if Election be the priviledge of the members of the Church, as ſuch, and the Eſſence of the Miniſteriall Call lies in it, then by divine appointment this is a neceſſary qualification for every Church-member to be in a capacity to give it.

For the *Minor* which is this, That the people neither are, nor by divine appointment are neceſſarily required to be in a capacity to give the eſſence of the call to the Miniſtry: This I ſhall prove from thoſe things which are requiſite to put men into ſuch a capacity. And thus I argue: Authority and ability to judge of the fitneſſe of a Miniſter, are neceſſary to make a man capable of giving the eſſence of the Miniſters call: But people neither have, nor is it neceſſarily required that they ſhould have theſe: *Ergo* they are not capable of giving the Eſſence of the Miniſteriall Call: I ſhall prove both propoſitions.

1. For the *Major*, there are two ingredients, *&c.* of both I ſhall ſpeak in order. 1. I ſay, to give the Eſſence of the Miniſteriall Call is an act of authority, I think this is unqueſtionable in all other caſes, whereſoever the power of calling to any office lies, there is an authority in relation thereunto: For inſtance, in a Corporation, If it belongs

to the Court of Aldermen to give the Essence of such an Office, it is an act of authority in them: So if it belong to the Court of Common councel to do it, it is an act of authority in them. *Et sic in cæteris.* It is true a man may give an Office to another, which he himself hath not. But if he have it not formally, he must have it virtually. In democraticall governments, where the officers are chosen by the body of the people, there, I say, the authority resides, and upon that very ground, the people taken collectively, are superiour in authority unto the Officers to whom they give the Call. And as the Apostle saith, The lesse is blessed of the greater, so may I say, the lesse is called of the greater. And as it is in civil respects, in some Parishes where the People are Patrons of the place, and give the Essence of the civil call to a Minister, to be the Minister of the place, as to all legall rights, &c. there, I say, the People are, *eo nomine*, invested with authority, for that worke, and their collation of this place upon that Minister, is an act of authority: So in like manner, if it belong to the people to give the essence of the Ecclesiasticall call unto a Minister, then the people hereby are impowred with an authority, and their act is an act of authority. And this is the first branch. Authority is necessary, &c. The use of this we shall see when we come to the *Minor*; In the mean time we must prove the other branch of the *Major*, or rather, that is proved already, that ability to Judge of a Ministers fitnesse is necessary to put a man into a regular capacity to give the essence of the call to the Ministry. And therefore I now come to the proof of the *Minor*, where I must shew;

1. That people have no authority, &c.

2. That they neither have nor by divine appointment are required to have ability to judge of a mans fitnesse for the Ministry.

1. That

1. That people have no authority nor can do any act of authority in the Church, is plain from hence, because they are by Gods appointment placed in a state of subjection, at leſt it is a cleare caſe concerning women, who are forbidden to do an act of authority (*i. e.* to preach publickly) because they are in a ſtate of ſubjection: And this is the more conſiderable, becauſe in that inſtance which our brethren ſo much inſiſt upon, *Acts* 1. in that election of an Apoſtle, not only the men, but women alſo did concurre, which they could not have done, if election were an act of authority, or if it were that act which gives the eſſence to an Officer.

2. As they want authority, ſo they want ability. And here there are two branches.

1. They have not 2. they are not required to have ability to judge, &c.

1. The people have not ability to judge of a mans fitneſſe for the Miniſtry; This we have proved before, and thither I refer the reader; and indeed, if our brethrens principles did not oblige them to the contrary, it would be out of doubt that for the body of almoſt all the congregations in the world, they are exceeding unable to judge of divers of thoſe abilities which are required to the Miniſtry.

It is little leſſe then a contradiction to ſay, that unlearned men ſhould be fit judges of another mans learning (and that learning is of neceſſary uſe to a Miniſter, neither will our brethren deny, nor can any one doubt, but he that is wholly a ſtranger to it) and it is no leſſe abſurd to think, that thoſe perſons who are unacquainted with the ſtratagems and ſubtilties of gainſayers and hereticks, ſhould be competent judges of a mans ability to convince gainſayers.

If it be ſaid, it is true, the people are not able to judge of theſe things themſelves, but they ſhould and may call

in the help of neighbouring Pastors. I answer. They may do it, and they may forbear it: According to our Brethrens mind, this is not necessary to the being, but to the well being of it: It is the people that have the whole and sole power of giving the Essence of the Ministeriall Call; So that if they will perversly or proudly refuse the help of Pastors, (as some of our brethrens mind have experienced the giddinesse and unrulinesse of Congregations, even when they have had Ministers to guide them, and much more when they have been left to themselves) they may do it: Or what if a Congregation be in an Island, or where there are no Pastors to help them? in that case they want ability to judge.

2. Who ever they are, that are intrusted with a power to give the Essence of the Ministeriall Call, they are to see with their own eyes. And surely they that blamed the Bishops, because they delegated the Pastorall work to others, which they ought to have performed personally, cannot excuse the people (if they were indeed intrusted herewith) that they manage it by others care and wisdom. Or else,

3. This great inconvenience will follow, that Christ hath intrusted this great power in such hands, as are unable of themselves to manage it. And thus I have dispatched the first branch, and shewed that the people are not able to judge.

The second branch is this: The people are not necessarily required to be able to judge of a Ministers abilities, as they ought to be, if it did belong to them to give the essence of the Ministeriall Call. I say, if it doth belong to every Church-member, as such, as his priviledge, to have a joint power to give the essence of the Ministeriall call, then it belongs to every Church-member as his duty, and he ought by divine appointment to be fit to judge of a Mini-

Ministers abilities, and this would be a necessary qualification in every Church-member, not onely that he be pious, but also judicious, and prudent, &c. and in all respects able to judge of a mans fitnesse for the Ministry, so that if a man were never so godly and desirous of Church-membership, &c. if he were apparently unfit to judge of a Ministers abilities (as many hundreds of godly people, unquestionably are) he ought not to be admitted a Church-member, because he wanted one necessary qualification for that relation: Which because it is a grosse and manifest absurdity, therefore it is not necessarily required that Church-members should be able to judge of a Ministers fitnesse, and by consequence, it follows that the people are not intrusted with giving the essence of the Ministeriall Call [illegible], which was the thing to be shewn; And thus much might serve for that point.

Onely, whereas there were divers Arguments urged by the Assembly, to shew, that the Essence of the Call did not lie in Election, which our Brethren here pretend to answer: I am under some necessity of attending their motion: But because some of them do manifestly refer to such things as have been fully discussed before, I shall not need to follow them [illegible], but onely take notice of such things, as have hitherto been omitted, or are now more strongly fortified.

It was argued from *Acts* 6. *Where the Apostles are said,* [illegible] *i. e. to constitute appoint,* *Acts* 7. 10. *Deut.* 1. 13. *Exod.* 18. 21.

They answer, *If* [illegible] *be taken for the constituting act in some places, so is the word chusing taken for the constituting act, in other places.* Luke 6. 13. *And of them he chose twelve, whom he named Apostles, and the people here are said to chuse, and that expresseth the putting of a man into office.*

Reply. It is true when chusing, is put by it self, it may signifie an appointing, if it be ascribed to one that hath a power to appoint, as it is, *Luke 6.* But it is far otherwise, where *chusing and appointing* are distinguished from, and opposed to one another, and the act of chusing, ascribed to the inferiours, the people, and the act of appointing, ascribed to the superiours, the Apostles, in such a case to say chusing is appointing, or to say, that the constituting act, was that which was done by the inferiours, is but one remove from impossible, that I say not ridiculous.

2. It was argued from *Tit.* 1. 5. *I left thee in Creet to ordaine, &c. what was he left there to give an adjunct of their call?* It must be considered, in what state the Church then was, and how usefull the paines of *Titus* might have been in other places, which necessarily called for his help; so that we may rationally conclude, if the people could have given the Essence of the Call without him, and if Ordination had been but an unnecessary Adjunct, it is no way credible that the Apostle would have diverted *Titus* from so great, essentiall, and excellent a service, for the doing of a businesse, which was but circumstantiall.

The onely answer they give, that signifies any thing is this: *That Titus was left in Creet, not onely to ordaine Elders, but also to set in order the things that are wanting.*

But that relieves them not, for the setting of things in order (which concerns onely the well being of the Church) was not to be put in competition with those other glorious services, which *Titus* might have done in the mean time, (and which concern the very Essence of the Church.)

It was argued from the *nature of Election of a people, which is more like making of a man a Minister, but their Ministers.* The people Deut. 1. 13. did look out men, but

it was Moses that made them Rulers: If the people have not office-power, neither formally nor eminently, they cannot make an Officer, for, nihil dat quod non habet.

They answer many things. 1. *That Election makes a man a Minister.*

Reply. That is a meer begging of the question.

2. *The act of Moses is not parallel either with Ordination or Election, but rather with Christs act in making Church-Officers, because onely Christ is the King of the Church; as onely Moses was the supreme Magistrate.*

Reply. 1. To speak strictly, not *Moses*, but God was the supreme Magistrate of the *Jewes*, and that policy was not a Monarchy, but a Theocrasy, as *Josephus* well calls it, and *Moses* indeed had no regall nor arbitrary power at all, but was onely Gods Secretary, to write his mind, and Gods instrument, to publish and execute Gods lawes: And look what *Moses* was to the *Jewes*, that are Ministers unto the Church: *Moses* was the publick interpreter of Gods Law, and Gods Vice-gerent, who in Gods Name, and according to Gods Word was to governe the people, and they were to be ruled by him; and albeit in some cases the people might have the power of Election, yet indeed it was *Moses* his act which was the constituting act in the creation of Officers: Just thus it is in our case, Ministers are the publick interpreters of Christs lawes, and Christs Vicegerents, who in Christs name, and according to Christs word, are to governe the people, and they are to be ruled by them; And albeit the people have a power of Election, yet indeed it is the act of the Ministers, which is the constituting act of an Officer: So that here is no difference at all in the power and authority of *Moses* and Ministers (in both it is depending and limited) onely the one is Civil, the other Ecclesiasticall.

3. *That*

3. *That rule* (they say) *is not universally true,* nihil dat quod non habet, *for freeholders by chusing, may make Burgesses and Parliament men. The freemen of a Corporation give the essentialls of their call to a Bailiffe, and why may it not be thus with the Church.*

Answ. There is *dispar ratio*, Because all things are to be regulated by law and institution, Civill things by a civill institution, and Ecclesiasticall things by a divine institution: Now what such freemen, *&c.* do, they have a charter, and a warrant for, whereby they are *quantum ad hoc* authorized for the work. If our brethren can shew a parallel divine institution, for the peoples being authorized to give the Essentials of the call to a Minister, then they do their businesse: But that they have not been able to do: In these cases the people have such office-power eminently in them, though not formally: And though each of the people considered distributively, are inferiour to such a Magistrate after he is chosen, yet, all the people taken collectively, are (as to that act) superiour to him who is to be chosen.

Another Argument was this. *That if the essence of the call lie in Election, then it will follow, that a Minister is onely a Minister to his particular charge, and that he cannot act as a Minister in any other place, which is a strange and false assertion.*

And this the Assembly prove by diverse considerations and Arguments, to which our brethren answer. But because all that is here said doth more properly belong to that former question *i. e.* whether a Minister be a Minister onely to his own particular Church, *&c.* I thought it more meet to bring it in there, and thither I refer the reader for a reply to all that here they say, which hath any sinews or substance in it.

Againe the Provinc. urged this: *That thence it will follow*

follow that there must be Churches before Ministers; which cannot be, for every Church must consist of persons baptized, and baptize them none can, but he that is a Minister. Christ therefore chose Apostles before Churches, and the Apostles ordained elders to gather Churches.

To this they answer, 1. *A Church must needs be before an officer, because he that is an officer, is made an officer onely to a Church, and therefore the Church is presupposed.*

Reply. This is a meer begging of the question, and we have already at large confuted it, and shewen, that a Minister is an officer, and acts as an officer even to such as are no Church.

2. *The Apostles were extraordinary officers, and therefore that instance proves not that ordinary officers must be before Churches.*

Reply. Our brethren must take heed of denying the exemplarinesse of the Apostles to ordinary Ministers in the administration of Church affaires. They themselves do oft make use of it: And it cannot be denyed by any rationall, or ingenious man, that the Apostles, as in some things they did act as extraordinary officers, and are no president for us, (as in single, and absolute, jurisdiction, *&c.*) so in other things, their acts were ordinary, and there examples binding as to us, as their preaching, baptizing, *&c.* And that this case is of the same nature, may appeare from hence, because the same reason which made it necessary for Apostles to be before Churches, made it also necessary for other Ministers to be before them. For the reason why the Apostles were to be before Churches, was this, because, by them Churches were to be gathered and baptized. And thus it was with the ordinary Ministers of those times, they also were instituted then, and are so now (by that lasting institution *Ephes.* 4. *&c.*) not onely for the building up of Churches already

constituted, but also for the bringing in of those who are not yet gathered, and therefore it was and is necessary still that Ministers be before Churches.

3. They say, *Acts* 14. 23. *When they had chosen them elders in every Church, the Churches therefore were before the chusing of elders.*

Reply. 1. That instance doth not at all enervate our assertion, for although some Churches may be before some elders, (which we never denyed) yet in the generall, a Minister must needs be before a Church. And thus much shall suffice for the vindication of those arguments which the Assembly used to shew that the essence of the call doth not lie in election. It now remaines that I undertake the defence of those arguments which they used to shew that the essence of the Ministeriall call doth consist in ordination: Wherein I must still crave the continuance of the liberty I have used, *viz.* not put my self or the reader to unnecessary trouble in animadverting upon every passage, but onely to observe such things as are argumentative and have not yet fallen within our cognizance.

CHAP. XIIII.

THE Assembly urged 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. and 1 *Tim.* 4. 14.

They answer, 1 *It is questionable whether laying on of hands be here meant of ordination, for that ceremony was used in the collation of gifts also.*

Reply. But forasmuch as this laying on of hands was done by an ordinary Presbytery, which had not such a power of conferring gifts by the laying on of hands (that being the peculiar priviledge of extraordinary officers) therefore it cannot here be rationally supposed to be so used

used in this place, but onely for ordination: And therefore this χάρισμα here said to be conveyed, must needs be rather concluded to be an office (which we often read to have been conferred by ordinary officers) then a gift (which we never read that an ordinary officer was intrusted to convey) But that our brethren will not beare with: For,

2. They say this χάρισμα is not an office, and here they repeat Mr. *Hookers* reasons, so that in answering one I shall answer both, and I must needs acknowledge that what is spoken upon this place is said very plausibly.

1. *χάρισμα most commonly signifies gift, not office.*

2. *A man is not said to forget the office that is in him (he is in his office, rather then his office in him) a man is said to stirre up his grace, not his office.*

3. *An extraordinary office (such as this was) could not be collated by ordinary officers.*

Lastly, they observe that this gift is said to be given, not but by the laying on of their hands as the cause, but onely with, noting onely the concurrence and connexion.

To all which I reply, 1. That both χάρις and χάρισμα are used in scripture for office as well as gift, our brethren themselves will grant, so that the word being indifferent, we must see which way other considerations will determine it.

For the second (where most difficulty lies) I reply.

1. A man may properly be said to neglect his office, or to disregard ἀμέλει, to be careless in his office, or in the execution of his office. I know no absurdity in it, either in the English, or in the Greeke Tongue: If a Magistrate be slothfull, careless, &c. we may properly say he neglects that Office that God hath put him in, he neglects his place. And as a man is said to neglect himselfe, when he neglects those things, and those actions which concerne himself; so a man neglects his office, that neglects

the works of his office: So for the word ἀναζωπύρει, ſtrip it of the metaphor, and it is no more but this, put forth, actuate, exerciſe thine office. *Pauls* bidding him ſtirre up his Miniſtry, is no more then what elſewhere he bids him, *fulfill thy Miniſtry*, do the work of an Evangeliſt. He that neglects the work of his Miniſtry, invalidates his office, diſuſeth, neglects his office, and he that fulfils the works of his Miniſtry, ſtirres up his office: For that other criticiſme, *that a man is in his office, not his office in him, the office is adjoyned to him, not inherent in him*: that is hardly worth taking notice of, becauſe the prepoſition ἐν is uſed ſo variouſly, ſometimes for one prepoſition, ſometimes for another, ſometimes for that which is inherent in him, ſometime for that which is adjoyning to him, (as all know that are not wholly ſtrangers to the Greek Tongue) that it is a vanity to lay any ſtreſſe upon it: Sometimes it is taken for ἀπό, ſometimes for ἐκ, ſometimes for διά, &c. and ſometimes *in* for *apud*, ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἶναι, is for a man to be *apud ſe*, for a man not to be beſides himſelf; ſo here the Office, ἐν σοὶ, for παρὰ σοὶ, *apud te*, with thee, which is committed to thee: And as men are ſaid to be in ſin, though indeed it is ſin that is in them, and they are ſaid to enter into their maſters joy, though to ſpeak properly their maſters joy enters into them, and a man is ſaid to be in drinke, though drinke be in him: So it cannot ſeeme ſtrange, if an office be ſaid to be in a man, though in propriety of ſpeech be be in his office.

For the third branch: 1. An extraordinary office might be conveyed in this caſe by ordinary officers: For 1. It is commonly thought that *Paul* did concurre in this ordination with that Presbytery.

2. They ordained him by divine direction: And as it was no diſhonour to *Paul* and *Barnabas* that they were ordained to that work *Acts* 13. 1, 2. by perſons inferiour to them,

them, seeing those persons did it by the immediate appointment of the Holy Ghost, so neither is it any prejudice to the extraordinarinesse of *Timothies* office, that it was conferred by ordinary officers, seeing they conferred it by the conduct of propheticall designation.

3. What more ordinary both in state and Church, then for a person to have an office conveyed to him, *viz.* Ministerially, by such as are inferiour to him, as the King by some of his subjects, the Arch-Bishop, by Bishops, the officers of a Church in our brethrens way by the people, whom I hope they will allow to be inferiour to their officers, at lest they professe that they do so.

For the last clause, I say two things.

1. That μετὰ is used for διὰ in other places besides this; *Acts* 13. 7. God brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ, *with* &c. διὰ *by an high hand*, as it is elsewhere phrased: So *Acts* 19. 27. *They told what things God had done* μετ' αὐτῶν *with them*, i. e. *by them*; especially seeing the μετὰ here, is expounded by διὰ in the other place, which our Brethren suppose to be parallel, that puts it out of doubt: And the reason wherefore the Apostle rather useth the word διὰ then μετὰ, was onely for better sound sake, (which the Apostles were not neglective of) it had been unhandsome to have said, διὰ μεσιτείας, διὰ διδύμων, and therefore he elegantly varies the word, and puts in μετὰ in stead of διὰ: But if you will needs have the word μετὰ to be taken in another sense then διὰ, *viz.* for *with*, and the word χάρισμα to be understood of a *gift*, then why may we not acquiesce in this sense, (which will both fully take off all your objections, and yet no way præjudice our cause) *neglect not the gift*, &c. *with the laying on of hands*: i. e. neglect not the gift, &c. nor the laying on of hands used in ordination, whereby thou wast solemnely set apart for, and obliged to the discharge of thy Mini-

steriall gifts, and office, Do not slight, forget, disregard that injunction &c. And this sense I am sure the Greeke will beare very well, and the English doth not exclude it.

Againe, if this satisfie not, it may be further added, that the word χάρισμα may be understood of the gift in 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. (forasmuch as the power of conferring such gifts was the priviledge of Apostles and extraordinary Officers) and the same word 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. may be understood of the office, the conveyance of which did fall within the verge of the ordinary Presbyters: And if you take it thus, then you may groundedly suppose, that the laying on of *Pauls* hands, was not done at the same time, nor to the same end, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, but that this latter did convey the office at one time (which is said most properly to be neglected 1 *Tim.* 4. 14.) and the former did convey a gift at another time, which he is called upon to stirre up, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. And this fully takes off all the difficulty. Nor can any wonder at the different sense of the same word, and same phrase, for that is so common a thing, not onely in divers Epistles, but in the same Epistle, yea the same Chapter, yea the same Verse sometimes, that one and the same word or phrase is differently to be understood, that none can justly stumble at it here. But lastly, it must be remembred that (if this place were to be understood in their sense, and did not contribute any thing to our cause) the truth we assert doth not so depend upon this place, that it must needs fall, if this place do not uphold it, forasmuch as it is founded upon divers other important places, as hath bin shewed.

The Assembly argued further: *The persons ordaining, were Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, and Presbyters, whom it is not likely that Christ would appoint to convey onely the adjunct*

adjunct of the Ministeriall call, and leave the great work of conveying the Office-power to the people.

To this they say two things. 1. In stead of giving an answer, they offer an argument; *that because one relate gives being to another, therefore the people must needs give being to the Minister.*

Reply. This is a meer fallacy: *Relata*, are considerable two wayes, as I may say, *in esse constituendo, & in esse constituto*, either as they are to be constituted, or as they are compleatly constituted: It is true, *Relata* considered *in esse constituto*, do give being one to another, the Father is not a Father unlesse he have a son. But then consider, relations *in esse constituendo*, as they are to be constituted, and so somewhat else gives being to them, when they are *relata*, the one gives being to the other, but there must be some other person or thing, which puts them into that relation, and it is that which we speak off: For instance, The husband gives being to the wife, and the wife to the husband: But there is something else which legally constitutes them in that relation, to wit the Act of the Justice, or the Minister: A Vice Chancellour is the Correlate of the University, yet the Chancellours act doth constitute him in the relation, and gives him the essence of his call.

2. They say, *Though Ordination be but an adjunct, yet, it consisting chiefly, if not onely, in prayer, Christ might employ the Elders in adding such an adjunct.*

Reply. But what sober man can imagine, that if this were all, The Apostles should take so many journeyes about Ordination; and should leave *Titus*, (who could ill be spared) in *Crete* to ordain elders: What, would he leave him onely to pray for a blessing upon persons to be constituted by others? It is strange he should leave him to a worke no way peculiar to his office, and a worke which

which a brother might performe as effectually as an officer?

And this shall suffice for the second Question.

CHAP. XV.

THE third and last question is this, Whether ordination may be done by the people? Wherein I shall need to say little, because indeed they say little to the purpose, and what they do say, is for the most part, either nothing else but a repetition of their disproved principles, or so infirme, that I may safely leave things to any ingenuous reader, who shall compare our arguments and their Answers.

Nevertheless I will not wholly omit this task also, but, where I can pick up any thing that requires an answer, and hath not been already dispatched, I shall here take notice of it:

They offer divers arguments to prove this proposition: *That in a Church which wants officers, some beleevers may lawfully ordaine without officers.*

1. *Else ordination were unattainable, for there is neither precept nor president of an ordinary officers acting in ordination out of the particular Church he is over. In the places which speak of ordination, to wit* Acts 6. *and* 13. 14. 1 Tim. 5. 22. 2 Tim. 1. 6. *the persons ordaining were all extraordinary, and so no president for ordinary officers: And for* 1 Tim. 4. 14. *we see nothing to convince us that it was an ordinary Presbytery.*

Answer. 1. There are divers practises lawfully used (even in our brethrens judgment) which yet we find no president for, but such as extraordinary persons are concerned in: I will instance but in one, and that is excommunication,

nication which we never read practised but by the authority and concurrence of an extraordinary Officer. *Paul* practiseth it; *I have delivered him to Satan.* And the Church of *Corinth* practiseth it, but not without *Pauls* expresse command, and positive warrant and concurrence, 1 *Cor.* 5. 3, 4. *For I verily as absent in body, but present in spirit having judged already, &c.* —— *when ye are gathered together, and my spirit.* And yet our Brethren allow, and inferre this as a president for the practise of excommunication by ordinary Churches, and ordinary persons. And therefore good reason they should allow us the same liberty.

2. And the rather, because this makes against our Brethren as well as us; It is their own grant, that Ordination is an Institution of Christ now in force, and that it is to be managed by the Officers of the Church, where there are such. So that both they and we are thus farre agreed, that ordinary Officers may ordaine. Now if what they say be true, then there is neither precept nor president for the Ordaining of Officers, and so it follows from hence, not only that none but Officers may ordaine (which we assert) but also that Officers may not ordaine at all (unlesse they will say Officers may do that for which they have neither precept nor president) so that our brethrens argument, either doth not præjudice us, or else it enervates their own principles.

3. The true way therefore to discern what acts of extraordinary Officers are presidentiall to ordinary, and what not, is this: Those actions which were proper to those times, those actions which were the results of extraordinary gifts, those actions which were appendants to an extraordinary jurisdiction, those are no presidents for us. The Apostles healing the sick by anointing with oyl, their preaching without study, their ordering of the Church affaires by their single jurisdiction, these things are unimi-

table by us. But now on the otherside, Those actions of extraordinary Officers which are common to all the ages of the Church, those, which may be transacted by ordinary gifts, and ordinary jurisdiction, those are presidents for us: The Apostles publick praying, and preaching, administring the Sacraments, authoritative rebuking, ruling, censuring, &c. I say, their acting of those things, is and was ever by the Church taken to be a president for ordinary Officers acting the same things. Now forasmuch as Ordination is allowed by our Brethren, to be one of those New Testament practises yet to be continued, by virtue of these instances, &c. It follows that the practice of the Apostles therein (though they were extraordinary Officers) is a president for us, onely here is the difference (wherein I am willing any indifferent man should be umpire) whether it is a president for the peoples ordaining, (who, though in things belonging to them, they did act distinctly from, and concurrently with the Apostles; as in the businesse of Election, yet never do we find them ordaining or joyning with the Apostles in the work of Ordination) or whether it be not rather a president for Ministers Ordaining, who are the undoubted successors of the Apostles, and who did act with them in such works.

4. And Lastly, for that 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. how faintly and impertinently do they speak? What if you meet with nothing that convinceth you, that this was an ordinary Presbytery? sure I am you meet with nothing that convinceth you they were extraordinary: And it is a great deal more rationall for us to think they were ordinary persons (of whom we read nothing which was extraordinary) then to fancy them to be extraordinary, (of which we have no evidence at all) the proof lies upon their side. I need no positive proof to perswade me to take a man

for

for an ordinary person, he is justly presumed so to be, till some *indicia*, or discoveries of an extraordinary state break forth: But now, if one will assert, that another is an extraordinary person, he must have positive proof for it, which if our brethren can bring, to prove this Presbytery to be extraordinary, we shall submit to them, but, till then, they must not take it ill, if we believe them to be ordinary. Thus much for their first and principall Argument.

2. They argue thus; *Those that may act in making Decrees in a Synod, they may Ordaine; But Believers (who are not Officers) may act in a Synod*, &c. Acts 15. 2, 22, 23.

I answer to both Propositions.

1. The *Major* may be questioned, because all those things are to be regulated by Scripture, now if we have Scripture precept or example for the one, *i. e.* for acting in a Synod (which they say here is) and not for the other, which we have proved there is not, then believers may do the one and not the other.

2. For the *Minor*, I deny, that the brethren may act in making Decrees in a Synod, I deny they did so in this place, we read not a word of it. All that we read is, that the whole Church consented to the decrees, and resolved upon the execution of them, which they might do, though they neither acted nor were present at the making of the Decrees: Even as thousands consent to Acts of Parliament, that have no hand in the making of them: And if our brethren think to prove this, they must bring better Arguments then any they have yet brought.

Another Argument they urge is this; *That Ordination consisteth in such Acts as may be done by the people; The people may fast and pray, and* (which may seem to be most doubtfull) *they may impose hands, if that be a rite still to con-*

tives, as appeares from Numb. 8 10. *where the children of Israel laid their hands upon the Levites.*

To this Instance, the Assembly gives such satisfying Answers, that I wonder how our Brethren could resist the evidence of them; and indeed their Replies are so inconsiderable, that I count it but lost time to make a rejoynder, and all that I shall desire of the Reader is this; That he would but use his reason, and lay aside his passion and prejudice, and compare what is said on both hands together, and I doubt not he will see, that all their assaults against them, are but like the dashings of the waves against a rock, whereby they break themselves to pieces.

But if all that satisfie not, I shall adde two Answers more.

1. Extraordinary instances are no presidents for ordinary cases. This was apparently an extraordinary case. The *Levites* and Church-Officers were not yet instituted: and to argue thus, that, because the people did lay on hands before those Church-Officers were created (who were afterwards to do it) therefore they might do it when such Officers were created and appointed for that work; It were as if a man should argue; Gifted men may preach where there are no Apostles nor Ministers to be had, therefore they may do it where there is plenty of Ministers: Or thus, *David* might eat the shew-bread when he could get no other, therefore any man may eat it when his table was spread with other bread.

2. Forasmuch as it is ridiculous to think that all *Israel* did lay their hands upon the heads of the Levites, therefore this was onely some of them, and those some (no doubt) were the first-born. Now it must be remembred, that as the *Levites* were taken instead of the first-born, *Num.* 8. 16, 17. so the first-born till then were in stead of the *Levites*, and till God instituted the Ecclesiasticall Offices

and

and Officers in *Israel*, the first-born were Officers; and so it concerns not the people at all, nor proves any right in them to do the same thing.

In the next place they come to answer some Arguments which are urged by the Assembly, to prove that Ordination did not belong to the peop'e.

Their Answers to the two first, are nothing else but repetitions of what hath been already discussed, and therefore I here wave them.

For the third, the Assembly observed; *That all that is written in the Epistles concerning the Ordainers and the qualification of the party ordained, is mentioned in the Epistles to* Timothy, *and* Titus, *who were Church-Officers; not in those Epistles which are written to the Churches.*

They answer. 1. *Charges may be directed to Officers, and yet the people required to concurre,* as Rev. 2. *and* 3. *If* Timothy *and* Titus *were to act these alone as Evangelists, then they are no presidents for us, if, with others, why not with the people as well as the Officers?*

Reply. They were to act alone in Ordination as Evangelists, and yet are a president for us. For, here are two things to be considered.

1. The work, *viz.* of Ordination, which was common and ordinary, and this is imitable.

2. The manner of doing it which was extraordinary; *i.e.* by their single power, and this is inimitable.

You will say, If the manner of this Ordination was extraordinary, then *Timothy's* practice in Ordination is no more a president for ordinary Officers Ordaining, then for the people Ordaining.

I answer, Yes; There is a different reason, because *Timothy* was one of the Officers or Persons ruling; and an extraordinary one, who alone might stand in the room of all other Officers; it may be there were no Officers pre-

sent when *Timothy* did ordaine; however his acting in this as an Officer, though extraordinary, may well be president for his successors, such as are Officers for the doing of the work (which is ordinary) though not for the doing of it by his single jurisdiction, which was extraordinary.

But now on the other side, for the people or the persons ruled, *Timothy* was not one of them, but sustained a distinct person from them, and there were people at that time unquestionably present, when ever *Timothy* and *Titus* Ordained; and the people even in the dayes of those extraordinary Officers, did retain their distinct liberties, and exercise those things, which did belong to them as people, as is plain in the case of Election, which they injoyned and practised.

And had Ordination belonged to the people as well as Election, certainly (notwithstanding the agency and presence of the Apostles therein, yet) we should have heard somewhat, at least, concerning the peoples concurrence; which because we hear not a syllable of, we therefore justly conclude, that Election did, and doth, belong to the people, but Ordination doth not.

I adde onely this; That look what reasons our Brethren have to look on the Apostles, *&c.* Baptizing, *&c.* to be a president for Ministers Baptizing, and not for the peoples baptizing; the very same reasons have we to conclude, that their Ordaining is a president for Officers Ordaining, not for the Ordination of the people.

2. They say, *All may be written to* Timothy *and* Titus, *because they were to direct others how to act in them. And therefore the Apostle writes to them about other things (which yet were not to be acted by them alone, but by the people) as the making of prayers for Kings, clothing of women in modest apparel,* &c.

Reply.

Reply. By this Rule, all things should have been written onely in the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, for they were to direct the people in all other things. But it is not simply the putting of a thing in this Epistle, which makes that act peculiar to Officers; But this is it which is justly insisted on, and which our Brethren should do well againe to consider, that, *Paul*, who was so carefull to order the affaires in every Church; yet in all his Epistles to those Churches, speakes not a word about the businesse of Ordination. Surely the Scriptures silence is argumentative as well as its speech, and it is oft urged in Scripture: *Melchisedek* is said to be without Father, *&c* because the Scriture is silent as to his geniallogie, so *Heb. 6.* — *our Lord sprang of Juda of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the Preisthood.*

And surely, it is not to no purpose that the Scripture is so silent, as to the point of direction about the mission of Ministers, in all those Epistles to people, but insinuates thus much to impartiall Readers, that the Holy Ghost looked upon the people, as persons not intrusted with that work.

The last thing urged by the Assembly was this; *That Ordination is an authoritative mission, an act of jurisdiction, an act which gives the essentialls of the Call. Private persons can no more conveigh power to another to administer Sacraments, then they can do it themselves.*

They answer. *That Ordination is no act of jurisdiction, nor would it be so though it did convey the Office-power: Freemen do convey Office-power to their Bailiffs, &c. yet do no act of jurisdiction.*

Reply. 1. This hath been answered before, to wit, Freemen have that power by a Constitution, but there is not any Constitution for the peoples conveying the Office-power to Ministers.

2. If

2. If the word *jurisdiction* be taken strictly, there is a difference made between Ordination and Jurisdiction, but if by an act of *Jurisdiction* they mean nothing else but an *act of Authority* (for that is the thing in question) then we have before proved that it is an act of Authority, and it were easie to make it good by Arguments.

We never find Ordination practised either in the Old or New Testament, but by persons in authority towards their inferiours. *Moses* Ordained *Aaron*, *Aaron* his sons, Christ his Apostles, the Apostles other Ministers: And if in all these it be granted to be an act of Authority, surely to deny it to be so in other Ministers, carrying on the same work, is an assertion neither true nor probable.

Again, Ordination is that act which constitutes a man in Office, and therefore must be an act of authority: But I must remember my work is not now to prove, but to answer, and therefore I forbear, and shall give my self and the Reader a writ of ease.

Only that the Reader may see the fruit of our Brethrens opinion (as indeed *posito uno absurdo, sequuntur mille*) I shall present him with a list of some novel and strange assertions which they have been hurried into by the force of their principles.

Novel and strange passages.

1. They implicitly deny Jesus Christ to have preached to the *Jews* as a teacher by Office, for thus they say, *p.* 13.

A man is not a teacher by office to all that he may preach to: If he preach to Heathens—— such as will not receive instruction, yet they are said to be taught, though they stumble at the Word, Mat. 13 54. *He* (*i. e.* Jesus) *taught them,*

them, and yet v. 57. they were offended at him. But a man is not a teacher by Office unto such heathens.

And the Apostles, according to them, were no Officers to Heathens; for they thus argue, *pag.* 18. *That such are no Officers to people as cannot exercise Church-government over them:* But (say I) the Apostles cannot exercise Church-government over heathens. *What have I to do to judge them that are without.* 1 Cor. 5. 12. *Ergo.*

2. *One that is really gifted for preaching (for ought we know) may lawfully preach without approbation from a Church, or others,* p. 20.

3. *It is the work of God and Christ onely, to send Preachers, let it be proved wherever a Presbytery was impowred to send.* pag. 126. And the Church is in no better case with them; for they say, *The person sending is Christ, neither a Church nor a presbytery,* pag. 125. And afterwards. *Sending is nothing else but Christ commanding to go and preach, not by a Presbytery, but by the word. And how a Presbytery can send, but by exhorting to follow the command of Christ, we know not. And in such a doctrinall way (for ought we see) a private Christian may exhort as well and much,* pag. 130. So that now both Presbytery and Church are thrust out of Office, and every one that is apt to teach, is commanded to preach, though neither Presbytery nor Church send him; And every private Christian hath as great a power to send Ministers, as either Church or Presbytery, which who can read without wonder?

4. *If the major part of a Congregation be wicked, we suppose then it is no true Church; and if once it were a true Church, it now it ceaseth to be so, or is unchurched.* pag. 237.

5. They call of Pastors administring the Sacraments not as Pastors, for thus they say, *If Pastors preach and give the Sacraments to their own flock, they act as Pastors,*

but if they perform these acts to any out of their own Congregation, they do it not as Pastors, pag. 280. Then they do it as gifted-men; for that is the other branch of the distinction. He that preacheth to strangers not as a Pastor, preacheth as a gifted-brother (that they grant.) And therefore he that administreth the Sacraments to any not as a Pastor, doth it as a gifted-brother.

6. *We see no inconvenience in asserting that heathens converted to Christianity may be a Church, before they be baptized*, pag. 288.

7. *A minister as oft as he changeth his place and people, needeth a new ordination*, pag. 290.

8. They say, *It is our mistake, when we assert that Baptisme doth admit, or make a man stand in relation to a Church, whereas baptizing is not into a Church, but into the name of Christ*, pag. 292.

9. They say, *If a people turn heretically, or starve a Minister, or combine to vote him out; the sin of the people doth nullify the office of the Minister*, pag. 296.

And, that I may tread in our brethrens steps who were so ready to catch at the appearance of a contradiction in the Provinciall Assembly, I shall put them in mind of two or three *contradictions* or seeming repugnancies at least, if not grosse contradictions.

Self contradicting passages.

They say, pag. 20. *that one that is really gifted for preaching may (for aught we know) lawfully preach without approbation from a Church or others*, pag. 20.

And they urge 1 Pet. 4. 11. to prove it the duty of gifted persons to preach, and surely if it be a duty, then it obligeth whensoever a man may do it lawfully.

And yet, pag. 149. they say, *We grant, that to a mans*

exerciſe of his gifts in this or that place, there is prærequired a call from the people, or Magiſtrate: And how can any man preach but he muſt preach in this or that place? *Quod nuſquam ſit non ſit.*

2. They ſay, *When an ordained Miniſter removes from one charge to another, They chuſe him not as one that is to be made a Miniſter, but as one already made and now to be made their Miniſter*, pag. 300. And yet, pag. 302. They ſay, *when he removes, he is to have a new Ordination, and a new Election. The Goſpel knoweth no difference between making a man a Miniſter, and making him their Miniſter.* pag. 302.

3. They ſay, *Men to be ſent to the heathens to convert them, ſhould be Ordained, becauſe the converſion of ſoules is a proper work of the Miniſtry*; pag. 300. And yet, pag. 302. they ſay; *When men are ſent to heathens, if they be Officers, yet they preach not as Officers: The converſion of ſouls is the work of the Miniſtry, not the proper work.*

FINIS.